

10 MANAGING RISKS OF EXTREME WEATHER

Chapter summary

Trends in losses from extreme weather and climate events are dominated by population increases and economic growth. Technological advances such as improved weather forecasting and early warning systems have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Better building codes, flood defenses, and disaster response mechanisms have lowered economic losses relative to GDP. The US economy's expansion has diluted the relative impact of disaster costs, as seen in the comparison of historical and modern GDP percentages. Heat-related mortality risk has dropped substantially due to adaptive measures including the adoption of air conditioning, which relies on the availability of affordable energy. U.S. mortality risks even under extreme warming scenarios are not projected to increase as long as people are able to undertake adaptive responses.

10.1 Socioeconomic context

Risks from human-caused climate change are affected by natural weather and climate variability, and are dominated by the exposure of wealth in coastal and other disaster-prone regions and vulnerabilities of poorer populations. The evolution of climate risk in the U.S. has been dominated by societal factors, rather than by changes to the actual weather and climate hazards. Deaths from weather disasters have decreased substantially since 1900, even as US population grew from 76 million in 1900 to over 331 million in 2020 (Goklany 2011). For example, the Galveston hurricane killed over 8,000 people in 1900 (0.01% of the US population), whereas the worst recent disaster, Hurricane Katrina in 2005, killed 1800 people (or 0.0006% of the US population) (NOAA National Hurricane Center 2025; US Census Bureau 2025).

Technological advances have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Early warning systems, satellite monitoring, and improved weather forecasting have reduced deaths, although exact numbers are hard to quantify (Deryugina and Hsiang 2023). US weather forecasting has been estimated to reduce losses from weather events with an annualized benefit of \$31.5B, protecting lives, property, and supporting agriculture and transportation (NRC 2010). Improved hurricane forecasts have reduced pre- and post-landfall spending, with annual per hurricane cost reductions estimated at \$5B (NBER 2024).

Infrastructure improvements have contributed to substantial reductions in losses from extreme weather events. Building codes, such as those implemented in Florida after Hurricane Andrew (1992) have reduced losses by ensuring structures can withstand high winds and floods. Homes built after 2002 showed minimal damage during Hurricane Michael (2018), unlike older homes (FEMA 2020). Sea walls, like the Galveston Seawall, protect against wave action and storm surge. The New Orleans Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System successfully mitigated storm surge during Hurricane Isaac (2012) (Battelle Memorial Institute 2013). Inland dams in the US help control flooding by storing excess water during heavy rains. It is estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) dams prevent about \$309M in annual flood damage in the TVA region and along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers (TVA, 2025). During Hurricane Helene (2024), TVA's strategies prevented approximately \$406M in potential damages (APPA 2024).

10.2 Data challenges

Since 1980, NOAA has provided a count of annual U.S. weather-related disasters that it estimates to have exceeded \$1Billion (inflation adjusted), showing a substantial increase starting in 2008. NOAA and

other government officials have cited the upward trend in the Billion Dollar Disaster series as evidence that climate change is making extreme weather worse (Pielke Jr., 2024). But over time, population and wealth have increased dramatically in the US, so when an extreme weather or climate event occurs, there is more damage even if there is no underlying trend in the frequency or intensity of extreme weather. Pielke Jr. (2024) demonstrates that losses per weather disaster as a proportion of GDP have decreased by about 80% since 1980, as shown in the figure below. Pielke Jr. (2024) also argued that in addition to relying on opaque data sources and unreported adjustments, NOAA failed to normalize its Billion Dollar Disaster data series properly for changes in population exposure and wealth. In May 2025 NOAA announced it has withdrawn the Billion Dollar Disaster product from publication (Pielke Jr., 2025).




Figure 10.1: Losses per disaster in NOAA’s billion dollar disaster dataset (the version downloaded in July 2023), 1980 to 2022. Source: (Pielke, Jr. 2024)

In summary, trends in losses from extreme weather and climate events are dominated by population increases and economic growth. Technological advances such as improved weather forecasting and early warning systems have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Better building codes, flood defenses, and disaster response mechanisms have lowered economic losses relative to GDP. And finally, the US economy's expansion has diluted the relative impact of disaster costs, as seen in the comparison of historical and modern GDP percentages.

10.3 Mortality from temperature extremes

10.3.1 Heat and cold risks

Changes in temperature extremes are among the most certain impacts expected in a warming world. It stands to reason that extreme heat events would likely become more frequent while extreme cold events would become less frequent. This pattern is evident in the historical period though not in the continental US (Chapter 6) and is expected to continue with further warming.

Mortality during heat extremes is typically caused by heat stroke and heat exhaustion, while mortality during cold extremes is typically caused by hypothermia and heart strain. Global mortality is substantially greater for cold conditions than for hot conditions (Zhao et al 2021, Ritchie 2024). Unlike with heat-related

mortality. Cold-weather risks set in even at moderately cold conditions (Gasparini et al. 2015, Lee and Dessler 2023). A 13-country study of 74 million deaths from 1985 to 2012 estimated that, on average, 7.7% of deaths were attributable to sub-optimal temperatures, of which 7.4% were attributable to cold and only 0.4% were attributable to heat (Gasparini et al. 2015). In other words cold weather killed 18.5 times as many people as did hot weather.




Figure 10.3.1. Mortality attributable to extreme and moderate cold and heat by country. Source: reproduced from Gasparini et al. (2015).

Figure 10.3.1 shows the distribution of results from Gasparini et al. (2015) by country. For the United States the fraction of deaths attributable to temperature was 5.9%, of which 5.5% was due to cold, thus cold weather killed 14 times as many people as hot weather.

The US EPA reports that, after adjusting for seasonality, the cold-related death rate in the U.S. (<https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-cold-related-deaths>) is about twice as large as the heat-related rate (see <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-cold-related-deaths> and <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-heat-related-deaths>).

There is strong evidence that people adapt to weather risks. Lee and Dessler (2023) reported that 86% of temperature-related deaths across 40 cities in the U.S. were due to cold-related mortality, and that due to adaptation the relative risk of death declined in hot and cold cities alike as seasonal temperatures increased. Allen and Sheridan (2018) found that short, early-season cold events were 2 to 5 times deadlier than hot events, but the mortality risk of both cold and hot extremes drops to nearly zero if the events occur late in the season.

Davis et al. (2003) examined heat-related mortality in 28 U.S. cities from the 1960s to the end of the 1990s and found that heat-related mortality declined by three-quarters over the sample period. Bobb et al. (2014) examined mortality data for 106 million people in over 100 cities U.S. cities and found a 60% decline in average heat-related mortality over the period 1987—2005, from 51 per thousand deaths to 19. They furthermore found that the greatest drop was among seniors over the age of 75. In a study of 42 million deaths in 211 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006, Nordio et al. (2015) found a more than 90 percent decline in the risk of mortality from excess heat.

In the context of large declines in heat-related mortality, by reducing mortality from cold events rising temperatures are associated with a net saving of lives.

The IPCC AR6 Working Group 2 Chapter 16.2.3.5 (O'Neill et al. 2022) acknowledges that heat-related mortality risk is declining over time:

“Heat-attributable mortality fractions have declined over time in most countries owing to general improvements in health care systems, increasing prevalence of residential air conditioning, and behavioral changes. These factors, which determine the susceptibility of the population to heat, have predominated over the influence of temperature change.”

It is both disappointing and telling to see how the IPCC misrepresents the situation in its AR6 Synthesis report. Section A.2.5 of that document states: “In all regions increases in extreme heat events have resulted in human mortality and morbidity (*very high confidence*).” But it is silent on the larger decline of deaths during extreme cold events.

The observed decline in US heat-related mortality has been specifically attributed to adaptation. Wang et al. (2018) exploited the spatial variability of heatwave-related mortality across 209 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006. While simple correlation appeared to imply an increase in mortality risk during heatwaves, accounting for adaptation to heatwave intensity caused the effect to fall to near zero and become statistically insignificant. They used the results of their epidemiological model to project heat-related mortality out to 2050 under four RCP warming scenarios (including RCP8.5) with and without adaptive behavior. Assuming people continue to adapt to the heatwave risks in the regions in which they live Wang et al. project not only no increase in heat-related mortality but an overall decrease for the US as a whole. They conclude that

“Ignoring adaptation would result in a substantial overestimate of future mortality related to heat waves... Accounting for adaptation, the overall heat-related mortality by 2050 would not change substantially over time compared to 2006.”

10.3.2 Mortality risks and energy costs

A 2016 study of US long term mortality risks associated with temperature variations (Barreca et al. 2016) showed that increases in mortality across the US are associated both with cold weather and hot weather. But over time, the introduction of electricity and the adoption of central heating and air conditioning (AC) dramatically reduced both risks, especially those associated with hot weather. Prior to 1960, a day above 90°F (32°C) added 2.2 percent to the average mortality risk rate, but after 1960 the same weather added only 0.3 percent to mortality risk, an 85 percent reduction. Prior to 1960 temperatures below 39°F (4°C) added about 1 percent to mortality risk but after 1960 the same weather only added about half that amount. Adaptation through conventional household improvements dramatically reduced public vulnerability to weather extremes. The entire reduction in hot weather mortality was attributable to widespread adoption of indoor AC, which depended on the availability of reliable and affordable electricity.

The corollary of this finding is that the use of heating and cooling systems depends on energy being affordable. Doremus et al. (2022) showed that wealthy and poor households in the US adjust their energy expenditures at similar rates in response to moderate temperature swings, but not in response to extreme temperature swings. When temperatures swing to very cold levels (< 5°C) energy spending in high-income

households rises by 1.2 percent but in low-income households by only 0.5 percent. On very hot days (>30°C) electricity spending in high-income households rises by 0.5 percent but does not change at all in low-income households. The latter result is observed even in subsamples where all households have AC. The implication is that even with widespread adoption of home heating and cooling systems, inability to afford energy leaves low-income households exposed to weather extremes.

References

- Allen, M.J. and S.C. Sheridan (2018) Mortality risks during extreme temperature events (ETEs) using a distributed lag non-linear model. (2018) *International Journal of Biometeorology* 62, 57–67 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-015-1117-4>
- American Public Power Association. (APPA, 2024, March 7). TVA flood mitigation strategies prevented approximately \$406 million in potential damages. Public Power Current. <https://www.publicpower.org/periodical/article/tva-flood-mitigation-strategies-prevented-approximately-406-million-potential-damages>
- Barreca, Alan, Karen Clay, Olivier Deschenes, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S Shapiro, “Adapting to climate change: The remarkable decline in the US temperature mortality relationship over the twentieth century,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2016, 124 (1), 105–159.
- Battelle Memorial Institute. (2013, December). Final independent external peer review report: Hurricane Isaac (2012) assessment (Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District). <https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Portals/56/docs/PD/PeerReview/TCN13-003HurIsaacAssessIEPRFinal.pdf>
- Bobb JF, RD Peng, ML Bell and F Dominici (2014) Heat-related mortality and adaptation to heat in the United States. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 122:811–816; <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/full/10.1289/ehp.1307392>
- Davis, Robert E., Paul C. Knappenberger, Patrick J. Michaels and Wendy M. Novicoff (2003) “Changing Heat-Related Mortality in the United States” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 111(14) November 2003 pp. 1712—1718 <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/pdf/10.1289/ehp.6336>
- Deryugina, T., & Hsiang, S. M. (2023). Does the environment still matter? Daily temperature and income in the United States (NBER Working Paper No. 31361). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31361>
- Doremus, JM, I. Jacqz and S. Johnston (202), “Sweating the energy bill: Extreme weather, poor households, and the energy spending gap.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2022.102609>.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2020, February 13). The role of Florida’s building codes in Hurricane Michael recovery. <https://www.fema.gov/case-study/role-floridas-building-codes-2018-hurricane-michael>
- Goklany, I. M. (2011). Deaths from extreme weather events, 1900–2010. Reason Foundation. https://a8d50b36.delivery.rocketcdn.me/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/deaths_from_extreme_weather_1900_2010.pdf
- National Bureau of Economic Research. (NBER, 2024, September). The value of improving hurricane forecasts. NBER Digest. <https://www.nber.org/digest/202409/value-improving-hurricane-forecasts>
- National Hurricane Center. (n.d.). Costliest U.S. tropical cyclones tables updated. NOAA National Hurricane Center. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/outreach/history/>
- National Research Council. (2010). Adapting to the impacts of climate change. The National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/12888/chapter/2>

- Nordio, Francesco, Antonella Zanobetti, Elena Colicino, Itai Kloog and Joel Schwartz (2015). “Changing patterns of the temperature–mortality association by time and location in the US, and implications for climate change” *Environment International* Volume 81, pp 80-86 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.04.009>.
- O'Neill, B., et al. (2022). Key risks across sectors and regions. In AR6 Working Group II Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability (pp. 2411–2538). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. www.ipcc.ch
- Pielke Jr., R. (2024). Scientific integrity and U.S. 'billion dollar disasters'. *npj Natural Hazards*, 1, Article 12. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s44304-024-00011-0>
- Pielke Jr., R. (2025, May 8). RIP NOAA's billion dollar disasters. The Honest Broker [Substack]. <https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/rip-noaas-billion-dollar-disasters>
- Ritchie, H. (2024). How many people die from extreme temperatures, and how this could change in the future: Part one. Our World in Data. <https://ourworldindata.org/part-one-how-many-people-die-from-extreme-temperatures-and-how-could-this-change-in-the-future>
- Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). (n.d.). Flood management. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.tva.com/environment/managing-the-river/flood-management>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). Decennial census by decade. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade.html>
- Wang, Yan, Francesco Nordio , John Nairn , Antonella Zanobetti and Joel D. Schwartz (2018) “Accounting for adaptation and intensity in projecting heat wave-related mortality” *Environmental Research* 161 pp. 464—471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.049>
- Zhao, Q., et al. (2021). Global, regional, and national burden of mortality associated with non-optimal ambient temperatures from 2000 to 2019: A three-stage modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(7). [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(21\)00081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00081-4)

11 CLIMATE CHANGE, THE ECONOMY AND THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON

Chapter summary

Economists have long considered climate a relatively unimportant factor in economic growth, a view echoed by the IPCC itself in the AR5. Mainstream climate economics has recognized that CO₂-induced warming may have some negative economic effects but they are too small to justify aggressive abatement policy, and trying to “stop” or cap global warming even at levels well above the Paris target would be worse than doing nothing. An influential study in 2012 suggested that global warming would harm growth in poor countries but the finding has subsequently been found not to be robust. Studies that take full account of modeling uncertainties either find no evidence of a negative effect on global growth from CO₂ emissions or find poor countries as likely to benefit from it as rich countries.

Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) estimates are highly uncertain due to unknowns in future economic growth, socioeconomic pathways, discount rates, climate damages, and system responses. The SCC is not intrinsically informative as to the economic or societal impacts of climate change. It provides an index connecting large networks of assumptions about the climate and the economy to a dollar value. Some assumptions yield a high SCC and others yield a low or negative SCC (i.e. a social benefit of emissions). The evidence for or against the underlying assumptions needs to be established independently; the resulting SCC adds no additional information about the validity of those assumptions. Consideration of potential tipping points at present does not justify major revisions to SCC estimates.

11.1 Climate change and economic growth

11.1.1 Overview: climate is a relatively minor issue for a modern economy

It has long been noted that economies tend to do poorly in very cold and very hot regions, with the optimum somewhere in between (Nordhaus, 2006). Temperature-sensitive economic activity migrates, whenever possible, to where it is best suited, and society always adapts to the local climate. Based in part on these observations, in 1992 Thomas Schelling, then President of the American Economic Association, argued that any effects of climate change on US economic activity would be small relative to the many other changes that would happen.

... Manufacturing rarely depends on climate, and where temperature and humidity used to make a difference, air conditioning has intervened. When Toyota chooses among Ohio, Alabama, and Southern California for locating an automobile assembly, geographical considerations are important, but not because of climate... Finance is little affected by climate; similarly for health care, or education, or broadcasting. Transportation can be affected, but improvements in all-weather landing and take-off in the last 30 years are greater than any differences that climate makes. If the average effect is a warming, iced waterways and snow removal may decline in importance. Construction is affected, mainly by cold, and if the average effect is in the direction of warming, construction may benefit slightly.

It is really agriculture that is affected. But even if agricultural productivity declined by a third over the next half century, the per capita GNP we might have achieved by 2050 we would achieve only in 2051. ...

I conclude that in the United States, and probably Japan, Western Europe, and other developed countries, the impact on economic output will be negligible and unlikely to be noticed.

(Schelling 1992, emphasis added)

Thirty years later virtually the identical point was made by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report:

For most economic sectors, the impact of climate change will be small relative to the impacts of other drivers. Changes in population, age, income, technology, relative prices, lifestyle, regulation, governance, and many other aspects of socioeconomic development will have an impact on the supply and demand of economic goods and services that is large relative to the impact of climate change.

(Arent et al. 2014, emphasis added)

That statement is validated by experience. Since 1900, the average global surface temperature anomaly warmed 1.3°C, about as much as the IPCC predicts will occur in the next century under a moderate emissions scenario. But even as the globe warmed and the population quintupled, humanity prospered as never before. For example, global average lifespan went from thirty-two years to seventy-two years, economic activity per capita grew by a factor of seven, and the death rate from extreme weather events plummeted by a factor of fifty!

While extreme weather events are costly, in all modern economies they are becoming steadily less and less important (Formetta and Feyen, 2019). Since 1990 weather-related disaster losses have declined as a proportion of global GDP (Pielke Jr , 2018, 2020) as have mortality risks (Formetta and Feyen, 2019). While economic weather-related insurance payouts are rising, this is fully explained by the growth in the size of the economy and the value of the insured asset stock. Past increases in episodes extreme weather have not had a significant effect (positive or negative) on the market value of insurance firms (Hu and McKittrick, 2015). Nor have past extreme weather events had a significant effect on US banks' performance (Blickle et al., 2021). The following chart is illustrative:




Figure 11.1 Global weather losses as a fraction of GDP. Source: Pielke Jr. (2023)

For these reasons, economists have long been reluctant to endorse attempts to “stop” climate change or even aggressively reduce GHG emissions because the costs would not be worth it. As one critic of the economics of climate policy put it:

Mainstream climate economics takes global warming seriously, but perplexingly concludes that the optimal economic policy is to almost do nothing about it... The contrast is striking. While climate science is sending out loud-and-clear messages that fossil-fuel disinvestment must start now, letting go of coal and oil and diverting resources into renewable energy technology systems, to keep warming below the 2°C limit (IPCC 2014), mainstream climate economics claims that overly ambitious climate targets will unnecessarily hurt the economy and immediate de-carbonization is too expensive. Most climate economists thus recommend humanity to just wait-and-see.

(Storm 2017)

The mainstream economics position on the climate policy question is best represented by the findings over the past three decades from Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) of climate change policy, for which Yale economist William Nordhaus was awarded the 2018 Nobel Memorial Prize in economics. IAMs combine economic, climate, and social data into a unified framework for simulating climate damages and evaluating the optimal policy response (Resources for the Future, 2025). Nordhaus’ work has generally supported modest global climate policy, with aggressive measures largely deferred to later in the century. Nordhaus developed the so-called Dynamic Integrated Model of the Climate and Economy model, or DICE, in the early 1990s (Nordhaus, 1993) to study the interaction between climate change, climate policy, and global economic growth over long times. DICE assumes global emission control can be coordinated at no cost and asks what the optimal policy target should be. The climate component of the DICE model is based on simplified climatological modeling. The version of DICE at the time of Nordhaus’ Nobel Prize award was described in Nordhaus (2018); it had a climate sensitivity parameter of 3.1°C for CO₂ doubling, consistent with the best estimate in contemporary IPCC reports (3.0°C).

The baseline (no policy) scenario incurs only \$0.4T in global abatement costs and leads to \$134.2T (trillion dollars) in global climate damages for a total cost of \$134.6T. The climate model component of DICE projects 4.1°C warming by 2100 relative to preindustrial temperatures. Note that this is a higher estimate of warming than many IPCC climate models.

The Optimal Policy scenario barely deviates from the business-as-usual path. It aims for +3.5°C warming, in other words we modestly scale back fossil fuel use and otherwise just live with almost all the warming. This suggests that most CO₂ emissions are less harmful than the policies that would be necessary to abate them. Trying to prevent warming causes costs quickly to outstrip the benefits. Pursuing a goal of capping warming at 2.5°C creates total costs of \$177.8T, which is \$43.2T worse than doing nothing at all. Nordhaus didn't evaluate trying to reach a Paris-type target of 1.5°C warming but it would be even worse.

A subsequent edition of DICE includes higher assumed damages from warming which, not surprisingly leads to more aggressive policy recommendations, as explained in the section below on the Social Cost of Carbon.

11.1.2 Empirical analysis of climate change and economic growth

Many other studies have used econometric methods applied to historical data, instead of IAMs, to study the potential impact of climate change on economic growth. Dell et al. (2012, herein DJO12) was an influential study that used a multi-country panel of national-level data spanning 1950 to 2005, in which they matched climate and economic data by averaging temperature from the local grid cell level up to the national level using population weights. They found that warming yields an insignificant positive effect on income growth in rich countries but a significant negative effect in poor countries. Moore and Diaz (2015) modified the DICE model to take that finding into account and concluded that it implied a dramatically higher Social Cost of Carbon due to the compounding effects of income loss over time.

A large subsequent literature has debated the robustness of the DJO12 findings. Burke et al. (2015) analyzed a global panel with temperatures averaged up to the national level and found a negative effect on growth from warming in rich and poor countries alike when the national average temperature is above 13°C. Zhao et al. (2018) used the G-Econ data set of Nordhaus (2006), which breaks economic activity down to the grid cell level, replicated DJO12-type results on the same subset of countries as used in DJO12 but then showed that on the full global sample warming increases growth in rich countries and poor countries alike, though the positive effect in the latter group is confined to where local temperatures are below about 16°C. Greßer et al. (2021) developed a regional economic data set for 1,542 sub-national regions around the world between 2005 and 2015 and found temperature had no effect on growth. Yang et al. (2023) updated the DJO12 data set and applied an estimator robust to mixed sample frequencies, finding that while temperature shocks exerted a temporary effect on income levels, they did not have a significant lasting effect on growth rates.

Newell et al. (2021) noted that there is no underlying theory to guide econometric model specification in this literature. Taking into account the arbitrary choices of which explanatory variables to include they identified over 800 possible model specifications. Using the Burke et al. (2015) data they used an estimation method that accounts for model uncertainty and found that the model form preferred by Burke et al. (2015), which implied negative effects of warming on growth even in rich countries, is explicitly excluded by the optimal model selection algorithm. Overall they could not detect a temperature effect on GDP or GDP growth, and they estimated the 95% confidence interval for the impact on global growth as of 2100 even under the exaggerated RCP8.5 warming scenario spans –86 percent to +388 percent. In other words the net effect is likely positive but too uncertain to distinguish from zero.

Barker (2023) criticized the DJO12 assumption that countries can be grouped into fixed “poor” and “rich” categories based on their incomes many decades ago. He noted that many countries were once poor but became rich over time, and if this is taken into account the original temperature effects reported by Dell et al. became small and insignificant.

Berg et al. (2023) argued that countries shouldn’t be grouped into large Rich/Poor categories because they are too heterogeneous. They instead estimated country-specific temperature response coefficients then grouped countries with similar response coefficients into small panels. They separately estimated responses to global and idiosyncratic local temperature shocks to better identify the climate signal in weather data. Overall they found countries experiencing negative effects of warming on growth outnumbered those experiencing positive effects, but only temporarily: eventually the effects reverse such that about twice as many countries experience a net positive growth effect. They also found global (as opposed to local) temperature changes are much more likely to benefit growth in poor countries than rich ones. In a simulation to 2100 even using the extreme RCP8.5 scenario they computed the average global GDP loss would be only 1.9% compared to a scenario with no warming. That is, instead of the economy growing 400% it would grow 398%. The implication of Nordhaus’ earlier analysis is that trying to prevent the warming would lead to far less than 398% growth.

To summarize, economists have long considered climate a relatively unimportant factor in economic growth, a view echoed by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report. Mainstream climate economics has recognized that CO₂-induced warming may have some negative economic effects but they are too small to justify aggressive abatement policy, and trying to “stop” or cap global warming even at levels well above the Paris target would be worse than doing nothing. An influential study in 2012 suggested that global warming would harm growth in poor countries but the finding has subsequently been found not to be robust. Studies that take full account of modeling uncertainties either find no evidence of a negative effect on global growth from CO₂ emissions or find poor countries as likely to benefit from it as rich countries.

The expectation that significant global warming would have a small impact on the U.S. economy was acknowledged quietly by the Biden Administration, even as the President was proclaiming a climate emergency. Figure 11.2, from a 2023 CEA-OMB report, shows the expected decrement in U.S. GDP as a function of temperature rise. The colored lines show the results of a dozen peer-reviewed published studies while the solid black line is their average. The figure could be summarized as “a few percent impact for a few degrees of warming”. Given that the economy’s annual growth rate is expected to be 1-2 percent, the impact of a warming globe is indeed negligible.




Figure 11.2: Decline in US GDP per degree of warming. Source: CEA-OMB (2023)

11.2 Models of the Social Cost of Carbon

The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is a tool for quantifying the economic impact of carbon dioxide emissions, helping policymakers weigh the costs and benefits of climate policies. It estimates the damage caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂, expressed in dollars. More formally, the SCC is the discounted present value of the current and future marginal loss of economic welfare due to an additional ton of CO₂ entering the atmosphere.

11.2.1 Estimating the SCC

Although the literature refers to “estimates” of the SCC, it is not estimated in the way other economic statistics are estimated. For instance, data on market transactions including prices and quantities can be used to estimate the current inflation rate or the growth rate of per capita real Gross Domestic Product, and there are well-understood uncertainties associated with these quantities. But there are no market data available to measure many if not most of the marginal damages or benefits believed to be associated with CO₂ emissions, so these need to be imputed using economic models.

For example, an influential component of some SCC calculations is the perceived social cost associated with changed risk of future mortality due to extreme weather. There is no market in which people can directly attach a price to that risk. At best economists can try to infer such values by looking at transactions in related markets such as real estate or insurance, but isolating the component of price changes attributable to atmospheric CO₂ levels is very difficult.

Economists use IAMs to compute the SCC. Two of the best known are the Climate Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation and Distribution (“FUND”, Tol 1997) and Nordaus’ DICE. IAMs embed a “damage function” or set of functions relating ambient temperature to local economic conditions. The assumptions embedded in the damage function will largely determine the resulting SCC. IAMs also assume a long-term discount rate or, as in DICE, compute the optimal internal discount rate as part of the solution.

One approach to developing a damage function is to begin with estimates of the costs (or benefits) of warming in specific sectors in countries around the world and aggregate up to a global amount. This was the approach used in FUND. An alternative approach is to develop a simple equation that penalizes global income according to a simple quadratic function of the average global temperature. This approach was used in DICE. In the case of the FUND model many hundreds of parameters had to be selected, whereas in DICE only three were needed and were originally chosen to assign a predetermined penalty (1.2%) to global output as of 3°C warming, with a quadratic term implying that damages grow with the square of the global average temperature anomaly. Barrage and Nordhaus (2024) recently changed the parameters to increase the penalty at 3°C to 1.6%, and added a discrete additional 1.0% GDP penalty at 3°C warming to account for “tipping points” (discrete large-scale environmental changes triggered by crossing a warming threshold) and a “judgmental adjustment” of 0.5% for excluded impacts at 3°C warming. Not surprisingly the newer version of DICE generates much higher SCC estimates than before.

The concepts of estimation and uncertainty do not readily apply to SCC calculations. By comparison, the question of whether precipitation has trended up or down along the South Carolina coast for the past hundred years can be addressed by collecting rainfall data, estimating a trend parameter and calculating statistical confidence intervals using methods with well-understood mathematical properties. In this way uncertainty can, in principle, be resolved by collecting more data and applying more accurate methods. But no amount of data collection can change the fact that many components of the SCC are unknown and rely on judgment and opinion based on knowledge of the underlying literature on the physical effects of climate change.

SCC calculations are thus best thought of as “if-then” statements: *if* the following assumptions hold, *then* the SCC is \$X per tonne. The list of ‘if’ statements includes the premise that the world’s climate and economy work according to the representation in the IAM. One way this may fail to hold is in the timing of warming. Every IAM assumes a value of the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS), which controls the amount of warming that results from CO₂ emissions and can be freely varied for the purpose of generating a distribution of SCC values associated with uncertainties over ECS. But as Roe and Baumann (2013) pointed out, time-to-equilibrium increases with the square of ECS, so an upward adjustment of the ECS parameter without an appropriate slowing down of the adjustment process can yield distorted present value damage estimates. In particular, the upper tail of warming associated with some commonly-used ECS distributions is physically impossible for even a thousand years into the future (Roe and Baumann 2013) yet in an IAM would be realized within a couple of centuries. Failure to align ECS with time-to-equilibrium will lead to an overestimate of the SCC value.

11.2.2 Variations in the SCC

Every level of the IAM calculation includes assumptions, some more influential than others. Key assumptions include the following.

- The discount rate: Climate damages accrue over a long time horizon, and costs a century or two in the future need to be discounted to the present. The higher the discount rate the smaller the present value of future damages and vice versa. The discount rate represents the opportunity cost of spending money today rather than investing it and then having more to spend tomorrow. Some economists have argued for the use of very low discount rates in SCC calculations, resulting in policy recommendations that favor relatively large immediate investments in CO₂ emission reductions. The downside is that other investments could potentially earn a larger rate of return for society.

- **Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity:** IAMs have customarily employed a value of 3.0°C or 3.1°C following the IPCC’s guidance. Empirically-estimated ECS values tend to be lower than this (see Chapter 9). Dayaratna et al. (2017, 2020, 2023) have shown that use of lower empirically-derived ECS values dramatically lower the resulting SCC estimate, even when low discount rates are used.
- **Damage function coefficients:** IAMs assume CO₂ and warming cause net harms that increase exponentially with temperature. More recently, IAMs have also incorporated effects from assumed potential climate tipping points. The FUND model took limited but explicit account of CO₂ fertilization effects in agriculture. Since the coefficients were selected prior the publication of the current evidence of global greening and the magnitude of benefits to crops from elevated CO₂ (see Chapters 2 and 10) the growth effects are likely understated. The DICE model (and others) did not explicitly include any CO₂ fertilization benefit, except to the extent it was taken into account in the literature consulted when picking the damage function coefficients. The damage function in FUND contains a region in which low warming yields net benefits in many regions, a finding which is supported by econometric models of warming and growth (Berg et al. 2023) and econometric simulations of agricultural changes (McKittrick 2025). The DICE damage function, by construction, rules out net benefits at any warming level.
- **Emission scenarios:** IAMs generate SCC estimates that increase as the pre-existing concentration of CO₂ increases. Consequently the value of damages later in the century will be higher, depending on the assumed baseline emissions over the coming decades.
- **Abatement costs:** IAMs represent the cost to the economy of reducing CO₂ emissions. If CO₂ emission reductions are assumed to be inexpensive, then the model will conclude that the optimal policy should aim for deeper emission cuts and vice versa.

It is informative to ascertain whether SCC results are invariant to changes in some assumptions. But when different assumptions result in higher or lower SCC values, the change in the SCC value does not provide *prima facie* evidence about the validity of the assumptions. For example, in 2023 the US Environmental Protection Agency raised its preferred SCC value about 5-fold over the estimates it had issued ten years earlier. This is not because new data had been collected or better mathematical methods had been invented, but because new assumptions had been used, and the validity of those assumptions was a separate question. One was that global agricultural damages were far higher than previously assumed, based on an analysis in Moore et al. (2017). But as discussed in Chapter 10, McKittrick (2025) showed that Moore et al. (2017) had used a database in which half the CO₂ change observations were missing. When as many of those observations as possible were recovered from underlying sources and the analysis was rerun, the projected crop yield losses disappeared and turned into gains at all warming levels. Hence the portion of the EPA’s SCC revision attributable to agricultural yield losses was unwarranted.

11.2.3 Evidence for low SCC

Chapter 2 reviewed evidence on climate change and greening, and Chapter 10 looked at climate change and US agriculture. Evidence shows that CO₂ fertilization has a stronger beneficial effect on agriculture than was known at the time that IAMs like DICE and FUND were parameterized. In particular Haverd et

al. (2020) found the observed CO₂ fertilization rate has been almost double what had been predicted by crop models. Dayaratna et al. (2023) used the updated empirical ECS distribution estimate of Lewis (2022), which assimilates modern instrumental and paleoclimatic temperature records, and allowed for a 30 percent gain in the CO₂ fertilization benefit in the FUND model, and found that, even at a low discount rate of 2.5 percent, the median SCC as of 2050 is only \$18.67, with a 24 percent probability of the true value being negative. At a five percent discount rate the median SCC value is negative until the mid-2040s and at 2050 was only \$0.37 with a 49 percent probability of being negative. Thus, under reasonable assumptions a mainstream IAM using updated scientific inputs yields evidence consistent with the SCC not being significantly greater than zero.

It should also be noted that the SCC is focused on the social costs of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use. It does not measure the private marginal benefits to consumers and society from the availability of fossil fuels. Public willingness to pay for fuels of all types indicates the value to society of reliable, abundant fossil energy. Tol (2017) estimates that the private benefit of carbon is large relative to the social cost. This can be illustrated by noting that the price of a gallon of gas indicates the marginal value to the consumer of the fuel. Suppose we assume a relatively high Social Cost of Carbon of, say, \$75 per tonne. Deflated by a MCPF value of 1.5 that would result in a carbon tax of \$50 per tonne, which equates to about 44 cents per gallon of gas (Lavelle, 2019). A pre-tax price of \$3.00 per gallon would imply the marginal social benefit of the fuel is nearly seven times the marginal social cost.

11.2.4 Tipping points

SCC calculations typically consider gradual impacts of a warming climate, such as slowly-melting glaciers and increasing average temperature. A driver of potentially high values of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is the introduction into models of discrete catastrophic outcomes associated with abrupt changes (Dietz et al., 2021). They are often referred to as “tipping points.”

The term “tipping point” mingles two different physical concepts that pose different research challenges. Many physical systems are inherently stable unless acted upon with sufficient external energy. For example an ice cap might remain intact over a wide range of temperatures but once the temperature crosses the 0°C threshold it melts. Such discontinuities are ubiquitous in nature and require an external force. Whether the force needs to be large relative to the size of the system depends on the underlying stability of the system.

A different type of tipping point is called a *bifurcation* and arises from the study of the internal dynamics of nonlinear systems (Crawford, 1991). Many systems have been observed to have more than one equilibrium point and can move between them with minimal or no external influence. For example a weather system might have two different equilibrium states: one calm and one with a tornado. A transition from one to another can happen either with no external force or with a minuscule change, such as a flap of the proverbial butterfly’s wings (Shen et al. 2014). The term “tipping point” is sometimes used to mean a bifurcation of this type and implies instability inherent in the system itself, which is not necessarily dependent on outside forces. It depends, instead, on parameters of the system taking values that support the emergence of bifurcations (Crawford, 1991).

The two different concepts imply different research questions. Regarding the first we are interested in whether components of the climate system are susceptible to abrupt discontinuities in response to sufficiently-large anthropogenic forcing. Regarding the second we are interested in whether the Earth’s climate system has inherent bifurcations that imply the possibility of abrupt transitions with or without external forcing.

Models have been developed that imply the latter is a possibility. Kypke et al. (2020) presented a simple climate model in which the GHG concentration is one of the parameters that controls the emergence of

bifurcations of the Arctic climate to one with both cold and warm equilibria. If sufficiently high GHG forcing combined with a sufficiently high rate of ocean heat transport are imposed a bifurcation becomes possible. More generally GCMs have been observed to contain bifurcations and multiple equilibria (Brunetti and Ragon, 2023).

The possible existence of bifurcations in the Earth's climate system implies abrupt transitions are possible, not just in response to large forcing but to small perturbations as well. This places tipping points into the category of low-likelihood and potentially catastrophic events, such as large meteor strikes. A key question to ask is whether those kinds of tipping points can be predicted. Current research has not resolved that question (Dakos et al., 2024) and indeed may not be able to since one implication of the “butterfly effect” is the existence of predictability boundaries of nonlinear systems (Palmer et al., 2014). It is therefore not obvious how to incorporate such possibilities into SCC calculations. Small variations in assumptions will lead to arbitrarily large variations in the resulting SCC with no grounds for choosing among them. If such tipping points are possible the most appropriate stance for economic policy is to maximize resilience to any form of external catastrophe since it is unlikely we could predict or prevent it from happening.

The IPCC AR6 (Chapter 1) focuses mainly on the first type of tipping point, namely an abrupt change in response to external forcing. This is also the meaning associated with popular usage of the “tipping point” concept in discussions of climate change (see <https://report-2023.global-tipping-points.org/what-is-a-tipping-point/> for example). As summarized by the IPCC AR6, there is evidence of abrupt change in the paleoclimate record, and some of these events have been interpreted as tipping points. Some projections with Earth System Models for example have produced tipping points such as Amazon forest dieback in response to specified values of CO₂ concentration or temperature increases.

The alarm surrounding climate tipping points is reflected by *The Global Tipping Points Report* that was launched at the COP28 on 6 December 2023 (Lenton et al., 2023). It identifies more than 25 parts of the climate system said to constitute tipping points. What gets classified as a climate “tipping point” is a moving target. The most common examples in the literature and assessment reports include: Greenland ice sheet disintegration, West Antarctic ice sheet disintegration, summertime disappearance of Arctic sea ice, Amazon rainforest dieback, coral reef dieoff, thawing of permafrost and methane hydrates, Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation collapse, boreal forest shift, West African monsoon shift, and Indian Monsoon shift.

All such tipping points require a certain amount of system instability in order to exhibit an abrupt transition in response to warming. For this reason there seems to be very little to discriminate between a tipping event and natural climate variability. Natural climate variability has in the past produced shifts in the West African and Indian monsoons, Amazon forest and coral reef dieback, and disintegration of the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets. These impacts can be reversed on the decadal timescales associated with natural climate variability and ecosystem responses.

Some abrupt changes are potentially more consequential, including collapse of the West Antarctic ice sheet and collapse of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC). The IPCC AR6 WG1 Summary for Policy Makers states:

"The Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation is very likely to weaken over the 21st century for all emission scenarios. While there is high confidence in the 21st century decline, there is only low confidence in the magnitude of the trend. There is medium confidence that there will not be an abrupt collapse before 2100." (C.3.4)

"There is limited evidence for low-likelihood, high-impact outcomes (resulting from ice-sheet instability processes characterized by deep uncertainty and in some cases involving tipping

points) that would strongly increase ice loss from the Antarctic Ice Sheet for centuries under high GHG emissions scenarios (e.g., SSP5-8.5)." (B.5.2)

For the purpose of SCC calculations the research question implied by this type of tipping point is whether such events have been observed in the past in climate conditions similar to what we currently experience or will in the near future. The IPCC AR6 finds little evidence for impending collapse of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation or the West Antarctic ice sheet. It finds there is no tipping point associated with Arctic Sea ice (AR6 Technical Summary p. 76)

Dietz et al. incorporated several potential tipping points (abrupt changes) into an SCC model and found they added about 25 percent to the estimate, mainly associated with thawing permafrost and release of methane hydrates. However the IPCC considers this scenario *very unlikely* (AR6 Technical Summary p. 107).

In summary, there may be unknown bifurcation tipping points that are associated with natural climate processes, but this possibility does not translate into specific guidance on the SCC. There are potential abrupt change points in the climate system in response to warming, although the IPCC assigns low probabilities to most, including the largest ones. When these have been taken into account the result is only a modest increase in the SCC value in the 21st century.

11.2.5 Are there alternatives?

It is increasingly being argued that the SCC is too variable to be useful for policymakers. Cambridge Econometrics (Thoung, 2017) stated it's "time to kill it" due to uncertainties. The UK and EU no longer use SCC for policy appraisal, opting for "target-consistent" carbon pricing (UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero 2022, Dunne 2017). However the uncertainty of SCC estimates doesn't mean that other regulatory measures are inherently better or more efficient. Many emissions regulations (such as electric vehicle mandates, renewable energy mandates, energy efficiency regulations and bans on certain types of home appliances) cost far more per tonne of abatement than any mainstream SCC estimate which is sufficient for establishing they fail a cost-benefit test.

References

- AR6: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- Arent, D.J., R.S.J. Tol, E. Faust, J.P. Hella, S. Kumar, K.M. Strzepek, F.L. Tóth, and D. Yan (2014) Key economic sectors and services. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WGIIAR5-Chap10_FINAL.pdf
- Barker, D. (2023) Temperature Shocks and Economic Growth: Comment on Dell, Jones, and Olken. *Econ Journal Watch* 20(2) 234-253 <https://econjwatch.org/articles/temperature-shocks-and-economic-growth-comment-on-dell-jones-and-olken>

- Barrage, Lint and William Nordhaus (2024) Policies, projections, and the social cost of carbon: Results from the DICE-2023 model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (13) e2312030121 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2312030121>
- Berg, Kimberly, Chadwick C Curtis and Nelson Mark. (2021) GDP and temperature: Evidence on cross-country response heterogeneity. NBER Working Paper 31327 June 2023 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31327>
- Blickle, Kristian; Sarah N. Hamerling, and Donald P. Morgan (2021) : How bad are weather disasters for banks?, Staff Reports, No. 990, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, NY <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/247913/1/sr990.pdf>
- Brunetti, Maura and Charline Ragon (2023) Attractors and bifurcation diagrams in complex climate models. *Physical Review E* 107 054214 <https://journals.aps.org/pre/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevE.107.054214>
- Burke, Marshall, Solomon M Hsiang, and Edward Miguel (2015). Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*, 527(7577):235–239.
- Council of Economic Advisors-Office of Management and Budget (CEA-OMB 2023) Methodologies and considerations for integrating the physical and transition risks of climate change into macroeconomic forecasting for the president’s budget. March 13, 2023. <https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/CEA-OMB-White-Paper.pdf>
- Crawford, John D (1991) Introduction to Bifurcation Theory. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 63(4) October 1991 991—1037.
- Dakos, Vasilis, Chris Boulton, Joshua Buxton et al. (2024) Tipping point detection and early warnings in climate, ecological, and human systems. *Earth System Dynamics* 15 1117—1135 <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-15-1117-2024>
- Dayaratna, Kevin and Ross McKittrick (2023) "Reply to comment on “climate sensitivity, agricultural productivity and the social cost of carbon in fund” by Philip Meyer" *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 2023 link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10018-023-00364-2
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and David Kreutzer (2017) Empirically-Constrained Climate Sensitivity and the Social Cost of Carbon. *Climate Change Economics* April 2017 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S2010007817500063>
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and Patrick J. Michaels (2020) Climate Sensitivity, Agricultural Productivity and the Social Cost of Carbon in FUND. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00263-w>
- Dell, Melissa, Benjamin F. Jones, and Benjamin A. Olken (2012). Temperature shocks and economic growth: Evidence from the last half century. *American economic journal: Macroeconomics*, 4(3):66–95, 2012. ISSN 1945-7707.
- Dietz, S., J. Rising, T. Stoerk, G. Wagner (2021) Economic impact of tipping points in the climate system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 2021 Vol. 118 No. 34 e2103081118
- Dunne, Daisy (2017), “Q&A: The Social Cost of Carbon,” Carbon Brief, February 14, 2017, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/qa-social-cost-carbon/>
- Formetta, Giuseppe and Luc Feyen (2019) Empirical evidence of declining global vulnerability to climate-related hazards. *Global Environmental Change* 57 101920 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.05.004>
- Greßer, Christina, Daniel Meierrieks, and David Stadelmann (2021) The link between regional temperature and regional incomes: econometric evidence with sub-national data. *Economic Policy*, 36(107):523–550, 2021.
- Haverd, V., Raupach, M., Briggs, P., et al. (2020). Higher than expected CO₂ fertilization inferred from leaf to global observations. *Global Change Biology*, 26, 2390–2402.
- Hu, Bin and Ross McKittrick (2015) Climatic Variations and the Market Value of Insurance Firms. *Journal of Insurance Issues* Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 92-111 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43741103>
- Kypke, K. L., Langford, W. F., and Willms, A. R.: Anthropocene climate bifurcation, *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, 27, 391–409, <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-27-391-2020>, 2020.

- Lavelle, Marianne (2019) Carbon Tax Plans: How They Compare and Why Oil Giants Support One of Them. *Inside Climate News* March 7, 2019 <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/07032019/carbon-tax-proposals-compare-baker-shultz-exxon-conocophillips-ccl-congress/>
- Lenton, T.M., D.I. Armstrong McKay, et al. (eds) (2023) *The Global Tipping Points Report 2023*. University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. <https://report-2023.global-tipping-points.org/>
- Lewis, N., (2013) An objective Bayesian, improved approach for applying optimal fingerprint techniques to estimate climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 26, 7414-7429. <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00473.1>
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended Crop Yield Meta-analysis Data do not Support Upward SCC Revision. *Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>
- Moore, Frances C. and Delavane B. Diaz (2015) Temperature impacts on economic growth warrant stringent mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(2):127–131, 2015. ISSN 1758-678X.
- Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>
- Newell, Richard G., Brian C. Prest, and Steven E. Sexton (2021). The GDP-temperature relationship: Implications for climate change damages. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 108 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102445>
- Nordhaus, William (2006). Geography and macroeconomics: New data and new findings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(10):3510–3517, 2006. ISSN 0027-8424.
- Nordhaus, William. (2018) Projections and Uncertainties About Climate Change in an Era of Minimal Climate Policies. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* August 2018, 10(3): 333-360. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/pol.20170046>
- Nordhaus, W. (1993) Optimal Greenhouse-Gas Reductions and Tax Policy in the "DICE" Model *American Economic Review* Vol. 83, No. 2, (Papers and Proceedings) pp.313-317.
- Palmer, TN, A Döring and G Seregin (2014) The real butterfly effect. *Nonlinearity* 27(9) 10.1088/0951-7715/27/9/R123 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/0951-7715/27/9/R123/meta>
- Parry, Ian, Robertson C. Williams III and Lawrence H. Goulder (1999). “When Can Carbon Abatement Policies Increase Welfare? The Fundamental Role of Distorted Factor Markets.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 37: 52—84.
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2018): Tracking progress on the economic costs of disasters under the indicators of the sustainable development goals, *Environmental Hazards*, DOI: 10.1080/17477891.2018.1540343
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2020) Economic ‘normalisation’ of disaster losses 1998–2020: a literature review and assessment,” *Environmental Hazards*, 2020, pp. 1-19
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2022) Global disaster losses: 1990-2023 Substack essay <https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/global-disaster-losses1990-2023>
- Resources for the Future (2025) “Social Cost of Carbon Explorer,” Resources for the Future website, accessed April 22, 2025, <https://www.rff.org/publications/data-tools/scc-explorer/>.
- Roe, Gerard H. and Yoram Bauman (2013) Climate Sensitivity: Should the climate tail wag the policy dog? *Climatic Change* (2013) 117:647–662 DOI 10.1007/s10584-012-0582-6
- Schelling, Thomas C (1992) Some economics of global warming. *The American Economic Review*, 82 (1):1–14.
- Shen, Bo-Wen, Roger A Pielke Sr and Xubin Zeng (2023) The 50th Anniversary of the Metaphorical Butterfly Effect since Lorenz (1972): Multistability, Multiscale Predictability, and Sensitivity in Numerical Models. *Atmosphere* 2023 14(8) <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos14081279>
- Storm, S (2017) “How the Invisible Hand is Supposed to Adjust the Natural Thermostat: A Guide for the Perplexed.” *Science and Engineering Ethics* vol 23: 1307—1331.
- Thoung, Chris (2017) “Is It Time to Kill Off the Social Cost of Carbon?” Cambridge Econometrics Blog, September 14, 2017, <https://www.camecon.com/blog/time-kill-social-cost-carbon/>.
- Tol, Richard S.J. (1997) On the optimal control of carbon dioxide emissions: an application of FUND *Environmental Modeling and Assessment* 2: 151—163.

- Tol, Richard S.J. (2017). "The Private Benefit of Carbon and its Social Cost," Working Paper Series 0717, Department of Economics, University of Sussex Business School.
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/sus/susewp/0717.html>
- UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2022). "Carbon Valuation." GOV.UK, last updated April 4, 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/carbon-valuation--2>.
- US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, "Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review", EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf accessed February 28, 2024.
- Yang, Yimin, Fei Jia, and Haoran Li. Estimation of panel data models with mixed sampling frequencies (2023). *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3):514–544.
- Zhao, Xiaobing, Mason Gerety, and Nicolai V. Kuminoff (2018) Revisiting the temperature-economic growth relationship using global subnational data. *Journal of environmental management*, 223:537–544, 2018.

12 GLOBAL CLIMATE IMPACTS OF U.S. EMISSIONS POLICIES

Chapter Summary

U.S. policy actions are expected to have undetectably small direct impacts on the global climate and any effects will emerge only with long delays.

12.1 The scale problem

The emissions rates and atmospheric concentrations of criteria air contaminants are closely connected because their lifetimes are short and their concentrations are small; when local emissions are reduced the local pollution concentration drops rapidly, usually within a few days. But the global average CO₂ concentration behaves very differently, since emissions mix globally and the global carbon cycle is vast and slow. Any change in local CO₂ emissions today will have only a very small global effect, and only with a long delay.

Following the emission of a pulse (release) of CO₂ into the atmosphere only about 40 ± 15 percent of the emitted CO₂ will have been sequestered after twenty years. That fraction rises to 75 ± 10 percent after a thousand years, and the remainder will be gradually removed over the ensuing tens of thousands of years (Ciais et al., 2013, pp. 472-473). Consequently, any reduction in U.S. emissions would only modestly slow, but not prevent, the rise of global CO₂ concentration. And even if global emissions were to stop tomorrow, it would take decades or centuries to see a meaningful reduction in the global CO₂ concentration and hence human influences on the climate.

Reducing the atmospheric stock of CO₂ would require emissions to fall below the natural sequestration rate, assuming the entire increase is anthropogenic. Since that rate has been averaging about 50% of emissions in recent decades, a reduction of global emissions by 50% would (at least temporarily) halt the rise in atmospheric CO₂. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol proposed to cap industrial nations' CO₂ emissions at a modest five percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012. Even though this policy was too difficult for most nations to implement, full compliance would not have substantially reduced atmospheric CO₂ levels. It would only have slightly slowed CO₂ growth, reaching the projected year 2100 level in 2105 instead (Wigley, 1998). Lomborg (2016) estimated that full compliance with the Paris Accord would not stop warming, it would only prevent about 0.1C warming and delay hitting the baseline year 2100 temperature levels by about a decade.

Thus, in contrast with conventional air pollution control, even drastic local actions will have negligible local effects, and only with a long delay. The practice of referring to unilateral US reductions as “combatting climate change” or “taking action on climate” therefore reflects a profound misunderstanding of the scale of the issue.

12.2 Case study: US motor vehicle emissions

The scale problem can be illustrated with reference to U.S. motor vehicles. The EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding focused on CO₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks in the U.S. because Section 202(a) of Clean Air Act mandates the EPA to set emissions standards for motor vehicles if pollutants are found to endanger public health or welfare. The 2009 Endangerment Finding therefore obligated the EPA to regulate emissions from new motor vehicles, ostensibly to reduce or eliminate climate-related harms to the US public.

Two questions that naturally arise are: (1) How large a reduction in CO₂ emissions would result from such regulation? and (2) What would be the climate impact of such regulation?

The first question can be addressed by comparing US vehicle-based CO₂ emissions to the global total. The second question can be addressed by using the fact that the reduction in global warming would be, according to the models relied upon by the EPA, proportional to the reduction in global emissions, keeping in mind that the change in the CO₂ content of the atmosphere in any given year is the result of total global CO₂ emissions, not just U.S. emissions.

In 2022, the emissions from U.S. cars and light duty trucks totaled 1.05 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide (GtCO₂, EPA 2024). Meanwhile global CO₂ emissions from energy use totaled 34.6 GtCO₂ (Energy Institute 2024). Hence U.S. cars and light trucks account for only 3.0% of global energy-related CO₂ emissions. To a first approximation we can say that even eliminating all US vehicle-based emissions would change the multidecadal warming trend by at most 3%. For the period 1979-2023, which has the most extensive global coverage of a variety of weather data types, warming trends are determined to a precision of about $\pm 15\%$, so the impact of reducing the rate of global warming by eliminating U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be far below the limits of measurability.

Given that global-average temperature is the most direct climate change metric, impacts on any secondary climate metrics (e.g. severe weather, floods, drought, etc.) from reducing U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be even less measurable.

Consequently, in contrast to the case of local air contaminants like particulates and ozone, even the most aggressive regulatory actions on GHG emissions from U.S. vehicles cannot be expected to remediate alleged climate dangers to the US public on any even remotely-measurable scale.

References

- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, et al. (2013): Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA
- EPA (2024) *Fast Facts: U.S. Transportation Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2022*. Available online at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockkey=P101AKR0.pdf>
- Energy Institute (2024) Statistical Review of World Energy. Available online at <https://www.energyinst.org/statistical-review>
- Lomborg, Bjorn (2016) “Impact of Current Climate Proposals” *Global Policy* 7(1) 109—118. Available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12295/full>.
- Wigley, T.M.L. (1998). “The Kyoto Protocol: CO₂, CH₄ and climate implications.” *Geophysical Research Letters* 25(13), 2285-2288

GLOSSARY

2XCO₂: Doubling of the atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂), a commonly used baseline for addressing climate change. In 2025, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were approximately 50% of the way to 2XCO₂ compared to 1800.

ABATEMENT: In the context of environmental policy, the reduction of emissions.

ACE (Accumulated Cyclone Energy): A statistical measure of a tropical cyclone's energy accumulated over its lifetime, calculated from a summation of the square of maximum sustained wind speeds.

ACIDIFICATION: A commonly used term for the reduction in ocean pH from more alkaline to less alkaline values.

ACRIM (Active Cavity Radiometer Irradiance Monitor) GAP: the gap in total solar irradiance data between 1989 and 1991 caused by a delay in the launch of a satellite-borne monitor in time to overlap and intercalibrate with the prior system.

AEROSOLS: Tiny solid or liquid particles suspended in the air.

ALKALINE: Having a chemical pH greater than 7.0. The “opposite” of acidic, which means a pH less than 7.0.

AMBIENT: Relating to the immediate surroundings of something.

ANTHROPOGENIC: Created by humans.

AR (Assessment Reports): Periodic assessments published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change evaluating current knowledge of the climate system, global change, and associated issues. An AR now consists of reports from three working groups, the first (WG1) concerned with physical science and the others concerned with societal impacts and mitigation strategies. The most recent was the AR6.

ATTRIBUTION: Assertion of a causal relation, chiefly from anthropogenic GHG emissions to observed climate patterns.

AUTOCORRELATION: The phenomenon in which the current value of a random time series variable is correlated with its value in a previous time period.

BIOMASS: The total quantity or weight of organic matter in a given area or volume.

CARBON: The 6th element in the periodic table. Popularly used as a shorthand term for carbon dioxide.

CMIP (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project): The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's organized effort to compare many different global ocean-atmosphere climate models when they are all forced with the same emissions scenario(s). The two most recent were the CMIP5 and CMIP6 for, respectively, AR5 and AR6.

CONUS: The contiguous 48 U.S. states.

DICE (Dynamic Integrated model of the Climate and Economy): An Integrated Assessment Model developed by William Nordhaus in 1993.

DISCOUNT RATE: The interest rate used to convert future costs and benefits into their present value. Varies inversely with present value so a high discount rate reduces the present value of future costs and benefits.

DRY ICE: Frozen carbon dioxide.

ECONOMETRICS: The branch of economics concerned with the use of statistical methods (chiefly multiple regression) to analyse economic systems.

ECS (Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity): The total amount of eventual global-average surface warming in response to a hypothetical doubling of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration compared to pre-Industrial levels.

EL NIÑO: The warm phase of the El Niño – Southern Oscillation, involving weaker upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and weaker Pacific trade winds.

EMISSIONS SCENARIO: An assumed scenario of future greenhouse gas emissions (or resulting atmospheric concentrations) based upon assumptions regarding global economic activity, the prevalence of fossil fuel use, and (sometimes) global carbon cycle model estimates of the rate of CO₂ uptake by land and ocean.

ENDANGERMENT FINDING (EF): The 2009 finding by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that emissions of well-mixed greenhouse gases (primarily CO₂) endanger human health and welfare.

ENSO: El Niño – Southern Oscillation, a prominent natural climate fluctuation involving year-to-year variations in the upwelling of cold water off the equatorial coast of South America and associated strengthening or weakening of trade winds across the Pacific Ocean.

FACE: (Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment) Large-scale open-air studies that expose plants to elevated CO₂ levels, simulating future climate scenarios.

FOSSIL FUEL: A natural hydrocarbon fuel such as coal, oil, or natural gas formed in the geological past from the remains of living organisms.

FUND (Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation, and Distribution): An Integrated Assessment Model developed by Richard Tol in 1997.

GBR (Great Barrier Reef): The world's largest coral reef ecosystem located off the northeast coast of Australia.

GDP (Gross Domestic Product): Total market value of all the final goods and services produced within a country's border, usually over one year.

GHCN (Global Historical Climatology Network): A time-varying number of globally distributed weather stations making hourly, daily, or monthly measurements of precipitation, temperature and sometimes snowfall and snow depth.

GLOBAL GREENING: The satellite-observed increase in greenness in most vegetated land areas observed since the early 1980s.

GNP (Gross National Product): Total market value of all the final goods and services produced by the citizens of a country, including exports and imports, usually over one year.

GDP (Gross National Product): Total market value of all the domestically-produced final goods and services produced by the citizens of a country, usually over one year.

GREENHOUSE EFFECT (GHE): The tendency for any planetary atmosphere containing greenhouse gases to be warmer in the lowest layers than if those gases did not exist.

GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG): An atmospheric gas that absorbs and emits infrared radiation, especially water vapor, CO₂, and methane.

HURST PHENOMENON: See long term persistence.

HYDROLOGY: The study of the movement of water, especially on land and in the atmosphere.

IAM (Integrated Assessment Model): A computerized tool that combines economics, climate science, and social sciences to provide quantitative relationships between human and Earth systems, helping to inform policy decisions.

IEA (International Energy Agency): A Paris-based intergovernmental organization, established in 1974, that provides policy recommendations, analysis and data on the global energy sector.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change): A panel of international experts and governmental representatives established by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988 to provide governments at all levels with scientific information that they can use to develop climate policies.

IR (Infrared): Heat radiation that all solid objects and greenhouse gases emit by virtue of their temperature.

LA NIÑA: The cool phase of ENSO, involving stronger upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and stronger Pacific trade winds.

LONG TERM PERSISTENCE (LTP, or HURST PHENOMENON): A form of autocorrelation in which random fluctuations induce long term but not permanent changes in the mean value of a series, which shows up in some climate data series as cyclical or trending patterns on short time scales.

MAIZE: Corn.

MODEL: A computer code or collection of codes which quantify our knowledge of various processes and the interactions between those processes.

MORTALITY: Death or number of deaths, usually expressed for a specific population and period.

NCA (National Climate Assessment): A periodic report mandated by the Global Change Research Act of 1990 summarizing the impact of climate change on the United States. There have been five NCA reports: NCA1 (2000), NCA2 (2009), NCA3 (2014), NCA4 (2017-18), and NCA5 (2023).

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development): A group of 38 member countries that have a democratic system of government and free economic systems.

PALEOCLIMATE: Climate of the distant past, before modern weather instruments were widely used (typically pre-1850), necessitating the use of “proxy” measurements such as tree rings, ice core, pollen records, etc.

PDI (Power Dissipation Index): A statistical estimate of the accumulated destructive potential of a tropical cyclone over time, calculated as a summation of the cube of the maximum sustained wind speeds.

PHOTOSYNTHESIS: The process by which plants grow, requiring carbon dioxide, water, and light at sufficiently warm temperatures (10 to 35 deg. C for optimal function).

PPM: Parts per million, a measure of the concentration of a substance in (for example) the atmosphere

PRE-INDUSTRIAL: The near-term historical period before which human greenhouse gas emissions were considered significant, usually assumed to be the mid-1700s.

RADIATIVE FEEDBACK: A change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in surface temperature.

RADIATIVE FORCING: The change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in greenhouse gases, anthropogenic aerosols, volcanoes, etc.

RCP (Representative Concentration Pathway) SCENARIOS: Different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report (AR5). RCP scenarios have a number label (e.g. RCP6.0) indicating how much radiative forcing they

assume in 2100 relative to pre-Industrial times, in Watts per square meter. RCP4.5 and RCP6.0 are intermediate scenarios, whereas RCP8.5 is an extreme scenario with very large future emissions of greenhouse gases.

REGRESSION: A statistical method for selecting the coefficients of a linear equation to explain the behaviour of a dependent variable in terms of variations in one or more explanatory variables.

RICARDIAN ANALYSIS: A method used in environmental economics named after David Ricardo to estimate the economic impacts of climate change, particularly on agriculture, by making use of the hypothesis that expected changes in the return to future agricultural activity will be capitalized into current land values.

SCC (Social Cost of Carbon): An estimate of the net economic damages, measured in present-value dollars, caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂ into the atmosphere.

SSP (Shared Socioeconomic Pathway) SCENARIOS: Different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). Some of the SSP scenarios are analogous to the older RCP scenarios, for purposes of continuity and comparison to earlier climate model assessments.

TC: Tropical cyclone.

TMAX: The daily maximum surface air temperature.

TMIN: The daily minimum surface air temperature.

TOA: Top of atmosphere.

TOXICOLOGY: The study of the adverse effects of chemical substances on living organisms.

TREND: A coefficient, usually estimated using linear regression, representing the slope of a line of best fit through a time series of data, indicating any tendency for the series mean to move up or down over time.

TSI (Total Solar Irradiance): The measure of the total amount of incident solar radiation per unit area, including all wavelengths of electromagnetic radiation, that reaches the Earth's atmosphere. Typically shown in units of watts per square meter (W/m²).

UHI (Urban Heat Island): The tendency for inhabited areas to be warmer than their rural surroundings, due to the replacement of natural land and vegetation with roads, parking lots, buildings, and waste heat sources.

USHCN: The U.S. Historical Climatology Network, consisting of quality-controlled temperature and precipitation data from 1,218 surface weather stations.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John Christy, Ph.D. is the Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Earth Sciences and Alabama's State Climatologist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He has a B.A. (Mathematics) from CSU Fresno and an M.S. and Ph.D. (Atmospheric Sciences) from the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign. He is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society and recipient of The NASA Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement for constructing, with Dr. Roy Spencer, the first global atmospheric temperature dataset from polar orbiting satellites. He served as Lead Author of the 3rd IPCC Assessment Report (2001), he has coauthored National Academy of Science expert reports on Climate Observations (1995) and Surface Temperature Reconstructions (2006), and he has served on the NOAA Climate Change Science Program, NASA's Earth Science Subcommittee, the National Research Council Space Studies Board and the EPA Science Advisory Board. In addition, Dr. Christy has given testimony in 20 Congressional Hearings.

Judith Curry, Ph.D. is Professor Emerita at the Georgia Institute of Technology, where she served as Chair of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences for 13 years. She is President and co-founder of Climate Forecast Applications Network (CFAN). Curry has a PhD in Geophysical Sciences from the University of Chicago. She has authored or coauthored 192 peer-reviewed papers in atmospheric and climate sciences, two textbooks, and most recently the book *Climate Uncertainty and Risk*. Curry is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, and a Member of the American Academy of Sciences and Letters.

The Honorable Steven E. Koonin, Ph.D. is the Edward Teller Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Institution. He has served as Under Secretary for Science at the Department of Energy (2009-2011), as Chief Scientist for BP (2004-2009), and as a professor at Caltech (1975 – 2004, the last nine years as Vice President and Provost). Koonin is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the JASON group of government advisors, as well as a Governor of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, having served in similar capacities for the Los Alamos, Sandia, Brookhaven, and Argonne National Laboratories. Other prior roles include a University Professor at NYU, a non-resident Senior Fellow at AEI, and a Trustee of IDA.

Koonin has a BS in Physics from Caltech and a PhD in Theoretical Physics from MIT. He authored the 2021 bestseller *Unsettled: What Climate Science Tells Us, What It Doesn't, and Why It Matters*, the 1985 textbook *Computational Physics*, and some 200 peer-reviewed papers in physics and astrophysics, scientific computation, energy technology and policy, and climate science.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D., is a Professor of Environmental Economics at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada. He holds a BA in economics from Queen's University, and an MA and Ph.D. in economics from the University of British Columbia. He has published widely in both economics and physical science journals on topics related to climate change, pollution and public policy. His book *Economic Analysis of Environmental Policy* was published by the University of Toronto Press in 2010. His background in applied statistics has led him to author or coauthor peer-reviewed publications across a wide range of topics in the physical sciences including paleoclimate reconstruction, malaria transmission, surface temperature measurement, climate attribution methodology and climate model evaluation. Professor McKittrick has made many invited academic presentations around the world, and has testified before the US Congress and committees of the Canadian House of Commons and Senate.

Roy W. Spencer, Ph.D., is a Principal Research Scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He holds a BS in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science from the University of Michigan, and MS and PhD in Meteorology from the University of Wisconsin -Madison. Spencer's published research has focused on monitoring of weather processes and climate change from Earth-orbiting satellites, as well as using simple physical models for diagnosing climate sensitivity and climate feedbacks. As a NASA Senior Scientist for Climate Studies he served as the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer (AMSR-E) flying on the Aqua satellite, providing our most accurate global measurements of sea surface temperatures, sea ice, and several other features of the climate system. Along with Dr. John Christy, Spencer developed the first satellite-based technique for global temperature monitoring, for which they received NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal and the American Meteorological Society's Special Award.

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 8:17 AM
To: Ross McKittrick; Travis Fisher
Cc: Steven Koonin; John Christy
Subject: Some Spencer inputs
Attachments: 1.3 Drivers of climate change [RS].docx; 1.3.2 Naturally externally forced changes [RS].docx; 1.3.3 Anthropogenically forced changes [RS].docx

I took it upon myself to write a preamble in **Section 1.3 Drivers of climate change** (attached), which seemed necessary to introduce some basic concepts.

Also attached are my initial submissions for **1.3.2** and **1.3.3**.

NO references added yet.

One of the things I believe we need to watch out for is *neglecting to come to conclusions along the way...* There is a tendency to get mired in the technical details without getting around to saying what each section might mean in eventual policy decisions related to the Endangerment Finding. In my experience, it is not possible to dumb-down this stuff too much. I suggest some sort of "Summary Boxes" with 1-2 simplified statements highlighting a main conclusion of each section that would have policy relevance.

-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 1:37 PM
To: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; roywspencer@hotmail.com <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Kickoff

Hi Travis

We developed the outline a bit further and assigned sections out yesterday. We'll keep you cc'd going forward.

Here is a Dropbox link that contains the current outline (also attached) which indicates who is working on each section

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=l1z3qj9v46e1t5f4ywwxq7p8c&dl=0

The link should give you all editing privileges.

I put folders in there for each of us. If the use of that Dropbox (which is on my own account) is acceptable for this project then we can share our work using it. Otherwise once we have an official Dropbox created we can transfer the material over to it.

Do you think it would be helpful to have a section specifically addressing the question of whether CO2 is a pollutant like CO, NOx, SOx, PM, etc.? If you want to add topics or suggest changes please do, the earlier the better as we begin filling out the contents.

Cheers,
Ross

On Mon, Apr 14, 2025 at 2:12 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

This is an excellent start! Can we move forward by iterating with this document for now? Please feel free to add whatever material you like, and I can collate if there are any simultaneous changes. I will leave the substance to you all because I view my role as a facilitator rather than a contributor, but please let me know how I can be most helpful.

Steve is correct that this document should be clear and understandable for non-experts. My understanding is that it should also be sufficiently technical and comprehensive to inform policymakers on all relevant aspects of the science.

One area I can help with might be targeting your work for the very brief window we have open at the moment. I am including a few lines verbatim below from key documents to highlight the areas of inquiry that are most relevant to the policymaking process. Of course, you all should make your own judgments about what to include versus what to leave out.

Here is a key section of the Clean Air Act, 202(a)(1): "The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe (and from time to time revise) in accordance with the provisions of this section, standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Such standards shall be applicable to such vehicles and engines for their useful life (as determined under subsection (d), relating to useful life of vehicles for purposes of certification), whether such vehicles and engines are designed as complete systems or incorporate devices to prevent or control such pollution."

Section 202 can be found [here](#).

Here is another key section of the Clean Air Act, section 302(g): "The term 'air pollutant' means any air pollution agent or combination of such agents, including any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive (including source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct material) substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air. Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term 'air pollutant' is used."

A threshold question raised in Justice Scalia's dissent in *Mass v. EPA* (which can be found [here](#)) is whether CO₂ falls under the definition of an "air pollutant" under the Clean Air Act. The majority in *Mass v. EPA* found that *any* compound emitted into the ambient air fits the definition of "air pollutant," leading to a colorful footnote in the Scalia dissent ("It follows that everything airborne, from Frisbees to flatulence, qualifies as an 'air pollutant.' This reading of the statute defies common sense."). A scientific interpretation of this definition could be very helpful.

The next section in the statute is 302(h), which defines effects on welfare: "All language referring to effects on welfare includes, but is not limited to, effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation, as well as effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well-being, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants." Positive impacts, including fertilization effects and beneficial warming, seem to be within scope here.

Section 302 can be found [here](#).

As you all develop the draft, I encourage you to include as many citations to published materials as possible (links would work fine as placeholders). I have found this works better under a tight timeline than going back and looking for sources later. Please also feel free to task me with any research help you might need.

Best,
Travis

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 8:10 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I assume we're writing for non-experts. If so, some educating beyond the root questions is in order (it always helps if people feel smarter after reading).

So I've taken Ross' material, added some broader context, and cast it into the forcing/response/impact syllogism that most non-experts seem to get. The result is attached.

I think we can deal with the differences relative to 2009 in an appendix.

SEK

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 6:34 PM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>

Cc: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; steven.koonin@gmail.com; roywspencer@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Kickoff

Excellent list Ross. Wildfires are a significant topic to be addressed.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2025, at 4:05 PM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

The attached represents my summary of the most questions needing to be answered, which I think this group is capable of answering in the next couple of weeks. Probably lots of material already in hand.

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 4:24 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

I can't thank you enough for taking this on under such a tight timeline. Let's use this thread to exchange information, links, etc., and as we move forward, I'll see about a document-sharing platform and a shared document to work on simultaneously.

Best,
Travis

<DE.memo.outline.Apr.11.[RM].docx>

There are two different classes of climate change as experienced by humans at the surface of the Earth: *internally-forced*, and *externally-forced*.

Internally-forced climate variability generally involves chaotic variations in the coupled ocean-atmosphere circulation system. These variations are not well understood and are difficult (if not impossible) to forecast, although they tend to have preferred time scales, generally years to several decades. Before the 1980s, this kind of climate change dominated climate research activities, as researchers tried to document and understand events such as the Medieval Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Little Ice Age, El Nino, La Nina, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the North Atlantic Oscillation, the Arctic Oscillation, and other modes of natural climate variability.

But since the 1980s, spurred on by the regulatory success of the 1973 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, these internal sources of climate change have mostly been abandoned by the international climate research community which has been heavily funded to examine the impact of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (especially carbon dioxide) on climate. This is an example of *externally-forced* climate change, which refers to small changes in Earth's *radiative energy balance*. This is the balance between global-average solar heating (energy input) and infrared cooling (energy output), both energy flows estimated to average 235 to 245 Watts per sq. meter. When these energy flows are in balance, temperatures tend to remain unchanged. When they are out of balance, temperatures generally warm or cool. In 2025, it is estimated that the Earth's radiative energy imbalance is about 1 Watt per sq. meter (out of 235 – 245), based upon recent warming of the deep oceans and the Earth's surface.

Significantly, that current global energy imbalance is weaker than the accuracy with which we can measure any of the energy flows in the climate system. This means recent warming could be mostly natural, and we would not know it. This is just one example of the many uncertainties — often unstated and not widely appreciated — associated with current climate research.

The most common method for understanding externally-forced climate change is the *forcing-feedback* paradigm. Using the simple example of a pot of water on a stove, energy input into the pot of water from a gas flame produces a *forcing* (warming), while energy loss by the warming pot to its surroundings is negative *feedback* (acting to counteract the forcing). Once energy balance is achieved, the temperature remains constant. All planetary climate systems (Earth, Venus, Mars, etc.) that experience a change in energy input must have net negative feedback, otherwise their climate systems would be unstable with runaway warming (or cooling).

But note that the forcing can be from the cooling side of the system. This is the case with anthropogenic global warming. You can increase the temperature of a pot of water by putting a lid on the pot, which reduces the water's ability to cool to its surroundings. Similarly, the addition of CO₂ to the atmosphere causes a very small reduction in the climate system's ability to cool to outer space. This causes a warming *tendency*. Just how much warming occurs depends upon *feedbacks*, which remain quite uncertain. The issue of uncertain feedbacks will be a recurring theme in this report, and is the reason why — even after decades of research with dozens of climate models — the uncertain global warming response to a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ still ranges over a factor of three.

Unlike natural internal climate variability, which can occur with little or no changes in the Earth's radiative energy balance, there are several known sources of natural externally forced climate change. These include changes in solar activity, Earth-sun geometry impacting how much sunlight reaches the Earth, and explosive volcanic eruptions causing temporary dimming of sunlight.

Solar activity varies on an 11-year sunspot cycle which has an associated, very small ($\sim 0.1\%$) variation in total solar output. This cycle is generally considered to be too small to reliably observe in the instrumental temperature record in the presence of rather large natural climate variability, although there have been published claims over the years of various regional weather variations statistically associated with the 11-year cycle. Therefore, changes in solar heating of the Earth by variations in the 11-year cycle are generally believed to not be responsible for recent warming trends, although this belief has been challenged (Soon reference(s)).

Earth-Sun geometry changes due to slow changes in the solar and terrestrial orbits can have a much larger impact on climate, but these occur on very long time scales, generally tens of thousands of years and longer. The most famous of these is the Milankovitch cycles which are believed to have caused the semi-periodic major Ice Ages and the interglacial periods of relative warmth, such as what humanity has experienced in recent millennia. These changes, though, are too small on the time scale of $\sim 1,000$ years to account for recent warming trends.

Explosive stratovolcano eruptions such as El Chichon in 1983, and especially Mt. Pinatubo in 1991, can produce sunlight dimming for a period of 1-3 years, causing temporary summertime cooling. These impacts are short-lived, but the 1991 event was sufficiently strong (2 to 4% reduction in sunlight reaching the surface) to cause measurable summertime cooling in the Northern Hemisphere in 1992.

None of these known sources of natural externally forced changes in the climate system are believed to be sufficient to cause recent warming trends. They are generally lost in the "noise" of natural climate variability, discussed in the previous section.

The recent warming of the climate system is widely believed to be the result of anthropogenic (human-caused) forcing, mostly due to carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning. In 2025, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ is about 430 parts per million (ppm), which is approximately 50% higher than it was in pre-Industrial times. CO₂ is one of the main “greenhouse” constituents of the atmosphere (the others being water vapor, clouds, and methane) which helps to keep the climate system warm enough to support life. As mentioned above, more CO₂ in the atmosphere slightly reduces the cooling of the climate system to outer space through infrared radiation. This change in the Earth’s radiative energy balance causes a warming tendency. Just how much warming that occurs depends upon feedbacks, which act to either amplify the direct warming effects of more CO₂ (positive feedback) or reduce the direct warming (negative feedback). The uncertainty of feedbacks (especially due to cloud changes) are the reason what climate models continue to disagree with each other by a factor of three in their future warming estimates.

There are other greenhouse gases which produce lesser levels of warming, such as methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases. Much of the current report will focus on the effects of CO₂ since it is considered the main anthropogenic driver of long-term climate change.

As mentioned above, most current climate research involves understanding the long-term response of the climate system to the addition of CO₂ to the atmosphere, primarily from burning of fossil fuels. An additional anthropogenic source has been the cooling effects of sulfate aerosols, which remains a source of considerable uncertainty. Part of that uncertainty is the indirect effects of sulfate aerosols on cloud formation, which can amplify their cooling effect. As a result, understanding of the causes of recent warming is not just through the warming effects of CO₂, but of the more uncertain cooling effects of sulfate aerosols.

From: Roy Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]
Sent: 5/22/2025 11:20:25 AM
To: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]
CC: John Christy [climateman60@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]
Subject: Spencer bio (Ross, remove my book titles if you think they are inappropriate)

Roy W. Spencer, Ph.D., is a Principal Research Scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He holds a BS in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science from the University of Michigan, and MS and PhD in Meteorology from the University of Wisconsin -Madison. Spencer's published research has focused on monitoring of weather processes and climate change from Earth-orbiting satellites, as well as using simple physical models for diagnosing climate sensitivity and climate feedbacks. As a NASA Senior Scientist for Climate Studies he served as the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer (AMSR-E) flying on the Aqua satellite, providing our most accurate global measurements of sea surface temperatures, sea ice, and several other features of the climate system. Along with Dr. John Christy, Spencer developed the first satellite-based technique for global temperature monitoring, for which they received NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal and the American Meteorological Society's Special Award. Dr. Spencer authored the New York Times bestseller *Climate Confusion, Global Warming Skepticism for Busy People*, and has testified before the US Congress.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 6:16 PM
To: Travis Fisher
Cc: Roy Spencer; Steven Koonin; Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Josh Loucks; Cohen, Seth
Subject: summary chapter and recommendations
Attachments: summary_conclusions (2).docx

I've quickly put together a summary chapter, and also added recommendations. In short the climate assessment system is really broken, a RFK Jr style purge is needed, IMO. I look forward to your feedback

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 1:48 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

We have been asked by the suits to include in the tasking letter a reference to the forthcoming NCA6 process (to be more forward-looking).

Please let me know if you have any suggested edits to the attached markup. Also, if you want to hear the backstory, please feel free to call me at 202-302-9953.

I don't think this edit to the tasking letter will require changes to the report, but I do think it's fair game to include positive suggestions in the report like "NCA6 authors could avoid these errors by ____." Up to you all.

On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 3:23 PM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

Anthropogenic... Or Natural?

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>

Date: 6/20/25 2:18 PM (GMT-06:00)

To: 'Judith Curry' <curry.judith@gmail.com>, 'Ross McKittrick' <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: 'Travis Fisher' <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>, 'John Christy' <climateman60@gmail.com>, "'Roy W. Spencer'" <roywspencer@hotmail.com>, 'Josh Loucks' <loucksj14@gmail.com>, "Cohen, Seth" <seth.cohen@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: RE: June 20 docs

On the title, something like "Conflation of anthropogenic and natural changes" might be better.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 3:02 PM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Josh Loucks <loucksj14@gmail.com>; Cohen, Seth <seth.cohen@hq.doe.gov>

Subject: Re: June 20 docs

I'm working on summary/conclusions section

But i'm thinking we need to add a chapter to the main text:

Inadequate discrimination between natural and human-induced causes of trends and variability (long title but you get the idea)

Among other things, this would include the little para that was formerly a footnote that is now homeless, and also much of the NASEM text.

All this is too much to introduce in the summary chapter.


On Fri, Jun 20, 2025 at 9:28 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Today's draft with post-meeting tidying.

Also, draft charge letter.

-Ross

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA

curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

1 SUMMARY EVALUATION OF NCA5

This Chapter presents a summary evaluation relative the charge we received from the OSTP: whether NCA5: (1) complied with the USGCRP's statutory obligation, (2) adheres to the core tenets of Gold Standard Science, and (3) can suitably inform federal climate and energy policy. The points made in this summary analysis refers to specific sections of this report as well as to the CWG25 Report.

1.1 Compliance with USGCRP's statutory obligation

As cited in Section 1.2 of this Report, the NCA Reports have a statutory obligation to prepare an assessment which:

- (1) integrates, evaluates, and interprets the findings of the Program and discusses the scientific uncertainties associated with such findings;
- (2) analyzes the effects of global change on the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, human health and welfare, human social systems, and biological diversity; and
- (3) analyzes current trends in global change, both human-induced and natural, and projects major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years.

With respect to these obligations, we have identified the following major shortcomings in NCA5:

- Failure to assess adequately the core of climate science and the hazard elements of climate impacts. Instead, the NCA5 focuses on evaluation of societal vulnerabilities, "Climate Action," and policy recommendations with a social justice emphasis (Section 1.2).
- Overconfidence in conclusions and inadequate assessment of uncertainty (Sections 3.1, 5)
- Failure to adequately discriminate between natural and human-induced causes of trends and impacts (Chapter x ~~NEW~~)
- Failure to adequately analyze current trends owing to reliance on short time periods for trend analysis (Chapter 6)
- Failure to critically evaluate emission scenarios and climate model simulations in making projections for the next 25 to 100 years (Chapter 6; Chapter xx in CWG25).

1.2 Adherence to the tenets of Gold Standard Science

With respect to the tenets of Gold Standard science:

- i. reproducible;
- ii. transparent;
- iii. communicative of error and uncertainty;
- iv. collaborative and interdisciplinary;
- v. skeptical of its findings and assumptions;
- vi. structured for falsifiability of hypotheses;
- vii. subject to unbiased peer review;
- viii. accepting of negative results as positive outcomes; and
- ix. without conflicts of interest.

We have identified the following major shortcomings in the NCA5:

- Lack of reproducibility. In the few examples that we examined closely, we identified one instance where we could not reproduce the findings of the NCA5 that should require only rudimentary data analysis (Section 4.1)
- Lack of transparency. In many instances, the Traceable Account fails to provide the appropriate justification for the Key Finding. Metadata was not readily accessible.
- Inadequate communicative of error and uncertainty. The Traceable Account for each Key Message provides a section on Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps; most of the accounts that we examined were superficial and uninformative. (Chapter 5)
- Not skeptical of findings and assumptions. The main text of the Chapters is, with few exceptions, not skeptical of its findings and assumptions. (Chapters 3, 5)
- Some hypotheses and Key Messages are not falsifiable. Many of the Key Messages are not scientific statements nor are they falsifiable. Here is one of many such examples: “Key Message 13.4 Equitable Distribution of Transportation Trade-offs and Benefits Requires Community Involvement.”
- Failure to acknowledge benefits of warming and additional atmospheric CO₂ (REFER TO CWG25)
- Inadequacy of the peer review process. The National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) undertook a detailed review of the draft NCA5 (NASEM 2023). While they raised some of the same concerns that we have articulated herein, their review is superficial overall and appears to be written by authors who share many of the biases of the NCA5 team. There is an inordinate focus on social and policy issues (e.g., every chapter is assessed under the heading “Comments on Equity and Justice”), rather than on the underlying science. In our assessment NASEM failed to apply the serious rigor one would expect. (Section 1.4, NEW CHAPTER)

1.3 Suitability for informing federal climate and energy policy

When scientific reports are being assembled that will be highly influential on policymaking, there are other desiderata (beyond the issues mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above), including statements about the strength of knowledge. The IPCC’s approach to assessing strength of knowledge is based on judgment of the available evidence and agreement among experts. More sophisticated knowledge characterizations for risk management include those provided by risk scientist Terje Aven (Aven 2017). The following elements are enumerated, with specific examples where NCA5 falls short in its knowledge characterization:

- The degree to which the assumptions made are reasonable/realistic based on background knowledge—concern about NCA5 focus on implausible extreme emissions and sea level rise scenarios
- The degree to which data/information exists and are reliable and relevant—NCA5 assessment of data quality and selection of short time periods for analysis falls does not support conclusions with high confidence.
- The degree to which there is disagreement among experts (including those from different environments or academic fields)—while the NCA5 is an interdisciplinary effort, skeptical

voices (such as the authors of this Report) were not included in the assessment or NASEM review process.

- The degree to which the phenomena involved are understood and accurate models exist—the NCA5 did not express appropriate levels of skepticism about climate models for purposes of attribution of the causes of warming and extreme events or for future projections.
- The degree to which the knowledge has been thoroughly examined with respect to unknown knowns and—the most obvious NCA5 shortcoming in this regard is relative neglect of natural climate variability

NCA5 is further problematic as a document to inform policy making because of the hyperbolic language employed to promote alarm and to advocate for specific policies. In recent decades, climate science has engendered passion and emotion. Indeed, some younger climate scientists have gone into the field to “save the planet.” The NASEM Review of the NCA5 underscores the endemic nature of this problem – their review appears to be written by authors who share many of the biases of the NCA5 team with an inordinate focus in the review on social and policy issues (e.g., every chapter is assessed under the heading “Comments on Equity and Justice”), rather than on the underlying science.

So it is not surprising that objectivity can suffer when climate scientists communicate their understanding to non-experts. Further, the field of climate science has been politicized by NetZero mandates. This lack of objectivity usurps the public’s right to make informed choices and undermines their confidence in the scientific enterprise.

Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, identified the problem in a 1980 editorial that resonates eerily four decades later:

Difficulty arises in the scientific community from confusion of the role of scientist *qua* scientist with that of scientist as citizen, confusion of the ethical code of the scientist with the obligation of the citizen, blurring the distinction between intrinsically scientific and intrinsically political questions. When scientists fail to recognize these boundaries, their own ideological beliefs, usually unspoken, easily becloud seemingly scientific debate.

1.4 Recommendations for NCA6

In view of the substantial problems with NCA5 in failing to comply with the USGCRP mandate and the tenets of Gold Standard Science, along with the endemic bias in the climate community towards alarmism and policy advocacy on the issue of climate change, there is not a clear path forward for the NCA6 at this time.

There are three fundamental issues to be addressed to support the USGCRP and federal policy making:

- A review of climate science (we suggest that the CWG25 Report meets this object)
- An assessment of weather- and climate-related hazards with an overview of approaches to reduce vulnerability through adaptation
- An evaluation of previous funding by USGCRP and recommendations for the future.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2025 10:32 AM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Travis Fisher; Roy Spencer; Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Josh Loucks; Cohen, Seth
Subject: Summary chapter
Attachments: summary_conclusions (2).docx

Draft of summary chapter is attached, with short recommendations section (cleaned up from yesterday's version). I look forward to your feedback

Below is the recommendations section that I came up with, I'm sure this will be controversial but it will at least trigger the group thinking about the issue:

Recommendations

In view of the substantial problems with NCA5 in failing to comply with the USGCRP mandate and the tenets of Gold Standard Science, along with the endemic bias in the climate community towards alarmism and policy advocacy on the issue of climate change, we do not see a clear path forward for the NCA6 at this time.

The USGCRP mandate to the NCA should be revisited. The current mandate is vague and off point, and it is not entirely surprising that successive NCA teams have interpreted the mandate differently. With regards to specific wording in the mandate, the term "global change" is ambiguous and outdated; it is no longer used in most climate-related documents. It is becoming increasingly clear that climate models are not fit-for-purpose for making regional projections 25 and 100 years in advance.

There are three fundamental issues to be addressed in the near term to support the USGCRP and federal policy making:

- Review of climate science (we suggest that the CWG25 Report meets this objective)
- Comprehensive risk assessment of extreme weather and climate events
- Evaluation of USGCRP portfolio of funded projects and recommendations for the future.

SOMETHING ABOUT ENERGY POLICY???



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

1 SUMMARY EVALUATION OF NCA5

This Chapter presents a summary evaluation relative to the charge we received from the OSTP: whether NCA5 (1) complied with the USGCRP's statutory obligation; (2) adheres to the core tenets of Gold Standard Science; and (3) can suitably inform federal climate and energy policy. The points made in this summary analysis refers to specific sections of this report as well as to the CWG25 Report.

1.1 Compliance with USGCRP's statutory obligation

As cited in Section 1.2 of this Report, the NCA Reports have a statutory obligation to prepare an assessment which:

- (1) integrates, evaluates, and interprets the findings of the Program and discusses the scientific uncertainties associated with such findings;
- (2) analyzes the effects of global change on the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, human health and welfare, human social systems, and biological diversity; and
- (3) analyzes current trends in global change, both human-induced and natural, and projects major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years.

With respect to these obligations, we have identified the following major shortcomings in NCA5:

- Failure to assess adequately the core of climate science and the hazard elements of climate impacts. Instead, the NCA5 focuses on evaluation of societal vulnerabilities, "Climate Action," and policy recommendations with a social justice emphasis (Section 1.2).
- Overconfidence in conclusions and inadequate assessment of uncertainty (Sections 3.1, 5)
- Failure to adequately discriminate between natural and human-induced causes of trends and impacts (Chapter x ~~NEW~~)
- Failure to adequately analyze current trends owing to reliance on short time periods for trend analysis (Chapter 6)
- Failure to critically evaluate emission scenarios and climate model simulations in making projections for the next 25 to 100 years (Chapter 6; Chapter xx in CWG25).

1.2 Adherence to the tenets of Gold Standard Science

With respect to the tenets of Gold Standard science:

- i. reproducible;
- ii. transparent;
- iii. communicative of error and uncertainty;
- iv. collaborative and interdisciplinary;
- v. skeptical of its findings and assumptions;
- vi. structured for falsifiability of hypotheses;
- vii. subject to unbiased peer review;
- viii. accepting of negative results as positive outcomes; and
- ix. without conflicts of interest.

We have identified the following major shortcomings in the NCA5:

- Lack of reproducibility. In the few examples that we examined closely, we identified one instance where we could not reproduce the findings of the NCA5 that should require only rudimentary data analysis (Section 4.1)
- Lack of transparency. In many instances, the Traceable Account fails to provide the appropriate justification for the Key Finding. Metadata was not readily accessible. (Chapter 5)
- Inadequate communicative of error and uncertainty. The Traceable Account for each Key Message provides a section on Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps; most of the accounts that we examined were superficial and uninformative. (Chapter 5)
- Not skeptical of findings and assumptions. The main text of the Chapters is, with few exceptions, not skeptical of its findings and assumptions. (Chapters 3, 5)
- Some hypotheses and Key Messages are not falsifiable. Here is one of many such examples: “Key Message 13.4 Equitable Distribution of Transportation Trade-offs and Benefits Requires Community Involvement.”
- Failure to acknowledge benefits of warming and additional atmospheric CO₂ (REFER TO CWG25)
- Inadequacy of the peer review process. The National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) undertook a detailed review of the draft NCA5 (NASEM 2023). While they raised some of the same concerns that we have articulated herein, their review is superficial overall and appears to be written by authors who share many of the biases of the NCA5 team. There is an inordinate focus on social and policy issues (e.g., every chapter is assessed under the heading “Comments on Equity and Justice”), rather than on the underlying science. In our assessment NASEM failed to apply the serious rigor one would expect. (Section 1.4, NEW CHAPTER)

1.3 Suitability for informing federal climate and energy policy

When scientific reports are being assembled that will be highly influential on policymaking, there are other desiderata (beyond the issues mentioned in sections 1 and 2 above), including statements about the strength of knowledge. The IPCC’s approach to assessing strength of knowledge is based on judgment of the available evidence and agreement among experts. More sophisticated knowledge characterizations for risk management include those provided by risk scientist Terje Aven (Aven 2017). The following elements are enumerated, with specific examples where NCA5 falls short in its knowledge characterization:

- The degree to which the assumptions made are reasonable/realistic based on background knowledge—concern about NCA5 focus on implausible extreme emissions and sea level rise scenarios
- The degree to which data/information exists and are reliable and relevant—NCA5 assessment of data quality and selection of short time periods for analysis falls does not support conclusions with high confidence.
- The degree to which there is disagreement among experts (including those from different environments or academic fields)—while the NCA5 is an interdisciplinary effort, skeptical

voices (such as the authors of this Report) were not included in the assessment or NASEM review process.

- The degree to which the phenomena involved are understood and accurate models exist—the NCA5 did not express appropriate levels of skepticism about climate models for purposes of attribution of the causes of warming and extreme events or for future projections.
- The degree to which the knowledge has been thoroughly examined with respect to unknown knowns and—the most obvious NCA5 shortcoming in this regard is relative neglect of natural climate variability

NCA5 is further problematic as a document to inform policy making because of the hyperbolic language employed to promote alarm and to advocate for specific policies. In recent decades, climate science has engendered passion and emotion. Indeed, some younger climate scientists have gone into the field to “save the planet.” The NASEM Review of the NCA5 underscores the endemic nature of this problem – their review appears to be written by authors who share many of the biases of the NCA5 team with an inordinate focus in the review on social and policy issues.

So it is not surprising that objectivity suffers when climate scientists communicate their understanding to non-experts. Further, the field of climate science has been politicized by NetZero mandates. This lack of objectivity usurps the public’s right to make informed choices and undermines their confidence in the scientific enterprise.

Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, identified the problem in a 1980 editorial that resonates eerily four decades later:

Difficulty arises in the scientific community from confusion of the role of scientist *qua* scientist with that of scientist as citizen, confusion of the ethical code of the scientist with the obligation of the citizen, blurring the distinction between intrinsically scientific and intrinsically political questions. When scientists fail to recognize these boundaries, their own ideological beliefs, usually unspoken, easily becloud seemingly scientific debate.

1.4 Recommendations for NCA6

In view of the substantial problems with NCA5 in failing to comply with the USGCRP mandate and the tenets of Gold Standard Science, along with the endemic bias in the climate community towards alarmism and policy advocacy on the issue of climate change, we do not see a clear path forward for the NCA6 at this time.

The USGCRP mandate to the NCA should be revisited. The current mandate is vague and off point, and it is not entirely surprising that successive NCA teams have interpreted the mandate differently. With regards to specific wording in the mandate, the term “global change” is ambiguous and outdated; it is no longer used in most climate-related documents. It is becoming increasingly clear that climate models are not fit-for-purpose for making regional projections 25 and 100 years in advance.

There are three fundamental issues to be addressed in the near term to support the USGCRP and federal policy making:

- Review of climate science (we suggest that the CWG25 Report meets this objective)
- Comprehensive risk assessment of extreme weather and climate events
- Evaluation of USGCRP portfolio of funded projects and recommendations for the future.

SOMETHING ABOUT ENERGY POLICY???

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2025 4:37 PM
To: Judith Curry; Roy W. Spencer; John Christy; Steven Koonin; Travis Fisher
Subject: Sunday afternoon draft
Attachments: DoE_Draft_May.25_4.30PM.docx

This one includes:


- all chapter references now listed, formatted and reconciled with chapter citations except 1 is still missing:

Chapter 7 White 2017

- Figures positioned neatly and figure/table captions in common format
- All Judy's edits adopted except
 - the one about the 3C range; under discussion
 - Chapter summaries - italics removed
 - Some white space removed though some retained
 - quotation formats cleaned up
- Mendeley citation for updated McKittrick and Christy precip and model-obs comparison data&code
- Co2 concentration - coral link as per Steve's and John's emails

NOT INCLUDED:

any new language on snow cover
any new language on Atmospheric Rivers and Pacific trends
any new language on Earth albedo
any new edits by Steve and John per most recent emails.



Impacts of Carbon Dioxide Emissions on the U.S. Climate

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Ad hoc Climate Working Group
United States Department of Energy
May 28, 2025

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Impacts of Carbon Dioxide Emissions on the U.S. Climate

Report to US Energy Secretary Christopher Wright

May 28, 2025

Ad hoc Climate Working Group:

John Christy, Ph.D.

Judith Curry, Ph.D.

Steven Koonin, Ph.D.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D.

Roy Spencer, Ph.D.

Copyright © 2025 United States

Suggested citation:

Ad hoc Climate Working Group (2025) Impacts of Carbon Dioxide Emissions on the U.S. Climate. Washington DC: Department of Energy, May 24, 2025.

Table of Contents

SECRETARY’S FOREWORD	VI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	VII
INTRODUCTION: OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT.....	VIII
PART I: DIRECT HUMAN INFLUENCE ON ECOSYSTEMS AND THE CLIMATE	1
1 CARBON DIOXIDE AS A POLLUTANT.....	2
2 DIRECT IMPACTS OF CO₂ ON THE ENVIRONMENT.....	3
2.1 CO ₂ AND GLOBAL GREENING	3
2.1.1 <i>Measurement of global greening.....</i>	<i>3</i>
2.1.2 <i>Photosynthesis and CO₂ levels</i>	<i>4</i>
2.1.3 <i>Rising CO₂ and crop water use efficiency.....</i>	<i>6</i>
2.1.4 <i>CO₂ fertilization benefits in IPCC Reports</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2 OCEAN ALKALINITY	7
2.2.1 <i>Changing pH</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.2 <i>Coral reef changes.....</i>	<i>8</i>
3 HUMAN INFLUENCES ON THE CLIMATE.....	12
3.1 COMPONENTS OF RADIATIVE FORCING AND THEIR HISTORY.....	12
3.1.1 <i>Historical radiative forcing.....</i>	<i>12</i>
3.1.2 <i>Change in atmospheric CO₂ since 1958</i>	<i>14</i>
3.2 URBANIZATION INFLUENCE ON TEMPERATURE TRENDS	15
3.3 FUTURE EMISSION SCENARIOS AND THE CARBON CYCLE	16
3.3.1 <i>Emission scenarios</i>	<i>16</i>
3.3.2 <i>The carbon cycle relating emissions and concentrations.....</i>	<i>19</i>
PART II: CLIMATE RESPONSE TO CO₂ EMISSIONS.....	25
4 CLIMATE SENSITIVITY TO CO₂ FORCING	26
4.1 INTRODUCTION	26
4.2 MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CLIMATE SENSITIVITY.....	27
4.3 DATA-DRIVEN ESTIMATES OF CLIMATE SENSITIVITY	29
4.4 TRANSIENT CLIMATE RESPONSE	30
5 MODELS VERSUS OBSERVATIONS IN THE RECENT PAST.....	32
5.1 INTRODUCTION	32
5.2 SURFACE WARMING	33
5.3 TROPOSPHERIC WARMING	35
5.4 VERTICAL TEMPERATURE PROFILE MISMATCH.....	37

5.5	STRATOSPHERIC COOLING	39
5.6	SNOW COVER MISMATCH	40
5.7	HEMISPHERIC SYMMETRY OF THE PLANETARY ALBEDO	42
5.8	US CORN BELT	43
6	EXTREME WEATHER.....	47
6.1	INTRODUCTION	47
6.2	HURRICANES AND TROPICAL CYCLONES	49
6.3	TEMPERATURE EXTREMES.....	53
6.3.1	<i>Temperatures in the US are becoming less extreme</i>	<i>54</i>
6.3.2	<i>Exceedances of a heat threshold.....</i>	<i>57</i>
6.3.3	<i>Heatwaves.....</i>	<i>58</i>
6.4	EXTREME PRECIPITATION.....	60
6.5	TORNADOES.....	67
6.6	FLOODING	68
6.7	DROUGHTS.....	68
6.8	WILDFIRES.....	69
7	CHANGES IN SEA LEVEL.....	75
7.1	GLOBAL SEA LEVEL RISE	75
7.2	U.S. SEA LEVEL RISE	75
7.3	PROJECTED SEA LEVEL RISE	80
8	UNCERTAINTIES IN CLIMATE CHANGE ATTRIBUTION	83
8.1	INTRODUCTION	83
8.2	ATTRIBUTION METHODS.....	84
8.3	ATTRIBUTION OF GLOBAL WARMING	85
8.3.1	<i>Natural climate variability.....</i>	<i>85</i>
8.3.2	<i>Optimal fingerprinting.....</i>	<i>89</i>
8.3.3	<i>Time series methods.....</i>	<i>90</i>
8.4	DECLINING PLANETARY ALBEDO AND RECENT RECORD WARMTH	91
8.5	ATTRIBUTION OF CLIMATE IMPACT DRIVERS.....	93
8.6	EXTREME EVENT ATTRIBUTION (EEA)	96
8.6.1	<i>Case study – 2021 Western North America heat wave</i>	<i>97</i>
	PART III: IMPACTS ON ECOSYSTEMS AND SOCIETY	104
9	CLIMATE CHANGE AND US AGRICULTURE.....	105
9.1	ECONOMETRIC ANALYSES	105
9.2	FIELD STUDIES OF CO ₂ ENRICHMENT	106

9.3	CROP MODELING META-ANALYSES	108
10	MANAGING RISKS OF EXTREME WEATHER	111
10.1	SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT	111
10.2	DATA CHALLENGES	112
10.3	MORTALITY FROM TEMPERATURE EXTREMES.....	112
10.3.1	<i>Heat and cold risks.....</i>	<i>112</i>
10.3.2	<i>Mortality risks and energy costs</i>	<i>114</i>
11	CLIMATE CHANGE, THE ECONOMY AND THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.....	117
11.1	CLIMATE CHANGE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH	117
11.1.1	<i>Overview: climate is a relatively minor issue for a modern economy</i>	<i>117</i>
11.1.2	<i>Empirical analysis of climate change and economic growth</i>	<i>120</i>
11.2	MODELS OF THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON	122
11.2.1	<i>Estimating the SCC.....</i>	<i>122</i>
11.2.2	<i>Variations in the SCC.....</i>	<i>123</i>
11.2.3	<i>Evidence for low SCC</i>	<i>124</i>
11.2.4	<i>Tipping points</i>	<i>124</i>
11.2.5	<i>Are there alternatives?.....</i>	<i>126</i>
12	GLOBAL CLIMATE IMPACTS OF U.S. EMISSIONS POLICIES	130
12.1	THE SCALE PROBLEM	130
12.2	CASE STUDY: US MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSIONS	130
	GLOSSARY.....	132
	ABOUT THE AUTHORS	136

SECRETARY’S FOREWORD

Energy, Integrity, and the Power of Human Potential

Over my lifetime, I’ve had the privilege of working as an energy entrepreneur across a range of fields—nuclear, geothermal, natural gas, and more—and I now serve as Secretary of Energy under President Donald Trump. But above all, I’m a physical scientist who sees modern energy as nothing short of miraculous. It powers every aspect of modern life, drives every industry, and has made America an energy powerhouse with the ability to fuel global progress.

The rise of human flourishing over the past two centuries is a story worth celebrating. Yet we are told—relentlessly—that the very energy systems that enabled this progress now pose an existential threat. Hydrocarbon-based fuels, the argument goes, must be rapidly abandoned or else we risk planetary ruin.

That view demands scrutiny. That’s why I commissioned this report: to encourage a more thoughtful and science-based conversation about climate change and energy. With my technical background, I’ve reviewed reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the U.S. government’s assessments, and the academic literature. I’ve also engaged with many climate scientists, including the authors of this report.

What I’ve found is that media coverage often distorts the science. Many people—even well-meaning ones—walk away with a view of climate change that is exaggerated or incomplete. To provide clarity, I asked a diverse team of independent experts to summarize the current state of climate science, with a focus on how it relates to the United States.

I didn’t select these authors because we always agree—far from it. In fact, they may not always agree with each other. But I chose them for their rigor, honesty, and willingness to elevate the debate. I exerted no control over their conclusions. What you’ll read are their words, drawn from the best available data and scientific assessments.

I’ve reviewed the report carefully and challenged its findings. I believe it faithfully represents the state of climate science today. Still, many readers may be surprised by its conclusions—which differ in important ways from the mainstream narrative. That’s a sign of how far the public conversation has drifted from the science itself.

To correct course, we need open, respectful, and informed debate. That’s why I’m inviting public comment on this report. Honest scrutiny and scientific transparency should be at the heart of our policymaking.

Climate change is real, and it deserves attention. But it is not the greatest threat facing humanity. That distinction belongs to global energy poverty. As someone who values data, I know that improving the human condition depends on expanding access to reliable, affordable energy. Climate change is a challenge—not a catastrophe. But misguided policies based on fear rather than facts could truly endanger human well-being.

We stand at the threshold of a new era of energy leadership. If we empower innovation rather than restrain it, America can lead the world in providing cleaner, more abundant energy—lifting billions out of poverty, strengthening our economy, and improving our environment along the way.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reviews scientific certainties and uncertainties in how anthropogenic carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions have affected, or will affect, the Nation's climate, extreme weather events, and selected metrics of societal well-being. Those emissions are increasing the concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere through a complex and variable carbon cycle, where some portion of the additional CO₂ persists in the atmosphere for centuries.

Elevated concentrations of CO₂ enhance plant growth, globally "greening" the planet and increasing agricultural productivity. They also decrease ocean alkalinity by an amount within the range of natural variability. That is possibly detrimental to coral reefs, although the recent rebound of the Great Barrier Reef suggests otherwise.

Carbon dioxide also acts as a greenhouse gas, exerting a warming influence on climate and weather. The world's several dozen detailed climate models offer little guidance on how the climate responds to that influence, with the average surface warming under a doubling of the CO₂ concentration ranging from 1.8°C to 5.7°C, generally higher than simpler, data driven estimates, which suggest 1.8 to 2.9°C

Detailed climate models generally run "hot" in their description of the climate of the past few decades - too much warming at the surface, in the lower- and mid-troposphere, and too much amplification of warming aloft. They also produce too much stratospheric cooling, too much water vapor increase, too much snow loss, and too much warming in the corn belt. The combination of overly sensitive models and extreme scenarios for future emissions has exaggerated projections of future warming.

Most extreme weather events do not show long-term trends. Claims of increased frequency or intensity of hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and droughts are not supported by historical data. Additionally, forest management practices are an often-overlooked factor in assessing wildfire activity. Global sea level has risen approximately 8 inches since 1900, but there are significant regional variations in tide gauge data driven primarily by local land subsidence; U.S. tide gauge measurements in aggregate do not show any long-term sea level acceleration.

The attribution of particular climate changes or extreme weather events to human CO₂ emissions is challenged by natural climate variability, data limitations, and inherent model deficiencies. Moreover, solar activity's contribution to the warming climate may be underestimated.

Both models and experience suggest that CO₂-induced warming may be less significant economically than commonly believed, and excessively aggressive mitigation policies could prove more detrimental than beneficial. Social Cost of Carbon estimates, which attempt to quantify the economic damage of CO₂ emissions, are highly sensitive to their underlying assumptions and so provide limited independent information.

The report supports a more nuanced and evidence-based approach to climate policy. The risks and benefits of a climate changing under both natural and human influences must be weighed against the costs, efficacy, and collateral impacts of any "climate action", taking into account the nation's need for reliable and affordable energy with minimal local pollution. Assumptions about future emissions should be grounded in reality. Climate models should be re-evaluated to address biases and uncertainties, and the limitations of event attribution studies should be clearly acknowledged. An approach that acknowledges both the potential risks and benefits of CO₂, rather than relying on flawed models and extreme scenarios, is essential for informed and effective decision-making.

INTRODUCTION: OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document originated in late March 2025 when Secretary Wright assembled an independent group to write a report on issues in climate science relevant for energy policymaking, with particular focus on the question of whether carbon dioxide emissions endanger the US public. We agreed to undertake the work on the condition that there would be no editorial oversight by the Secretary, the Department of Energy, or any other government personnel. This condition has been honored throughout the process and the writing team has worked with full independence.

The group began working in early April with a deadline of May 28. The short timeline and the technical nature of the material meant that we could not comprehensively review all topics. While the report is intended to be accessible for non-experts, we have omitted some introductory or explanatory material that can easily be accessed elsewhere. Nor have we attempted to survey entire literatures related to the topics covered. We have focused as much as possible on literature published since 2020 and referenced previous IPCC and NCA assessment reports. We have also used data through 2024 where possible.

The writing team is grateful to Secretary Wright for the opportunity to prepare this report and for his support of independent scientific assessment.

May 2025

John Christy, Ph.D.

Judith Curry, Ph.D.

Steven Koonin, Ph.D.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D.

Roy Spencer, Ph.D.

PART I: DIRECT HUMAN INFLUENCE ON ECOSYSTEMS AND THE CLIMATE

1 CARBON DIOXIDE AS A POLLUTANT

Chapter summary:

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) differs in many ways from the so-called Criteria Air Pollutants. It does not affect local air quality and has no human toxicological implications at ambient levels. It is an issue of concern because of its potential effects on the global climate, a complex issue that occupies much of this report.

The Clean Air Act of 1970 defined six so-called Criteria Air Contaminants subject to regulation (EPA): particulate matter, ground-level Ozone, Sulfur Dioxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, Lead and Carbon Monoxide (CO). In 2007, the Supreme Court ruled that greenhouse gases (CO₂ among them) were also “pollutants” subject to regulation under Clean Air Act (*Mass. v. EPA*, 2007). While the definition of “pollutant” is ultimately a legal one, there are important scientific distinctions between CO₂ and the Criteria Air Contaminants. The latter are subject to regulatory control because they cause local problems depending on concentrations that include nuisances (odor, visibility), damage to plants, and, at high enough exposure levels, toxicological effects in humans. In contrast, CO₂ is odorless, does not affect visibility and has no toxicological effects at ambient levels. It is a naturally occurring part of the atmosphere and a key component of human and plant respiration. CO₂ is essential for plant photosynthesis and higher levels are beneficial for vegetation. In these aspects, CO₂ is similar to water vapor.

Ambient outdoor air today contains about 430 parts per million (ppm) CO₂, increasing at about 2 ppm per year. The US Occupational Safety and Health Administration issues guidelines for indoor workplaces in which elevated CO₂ might be encountered, such as where dry ice is used. The Permissible Exposure Limit is 5,000 ppm over 8 hours (OSHA, 2024). Allen et al. (2015) reported evidence of diminished performance on some cognitive tasks among workers in office cubicles when exposed to CO₂ levels above 1,000-1,500 ppm. These levels are far larger than any plausible ambient outdoor value through the end of the 22nd century.

The growing amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere directly influences the earth system by promoting plant growth (global greening), thereby enhancing agricultural yields, and by neutralizing ocean alkalinity. But the primary concern about CO₂ is its role as a greenhouse gas (GHG) that alters the earth’s energy balance. How the climate will respond to that influence is a complex question that will occupy much of this report.

References

- Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency, 549 U.S. 497 (2007). <https://www.oyez.org/cases/2006/05-1120>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Criteria air pollutants. <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants>
- U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2024). OSHA occupational chemical database: Carbon dioxide. <https://www.osha.gov/chemicaldata/183>

2 DIRECT IMPACTS OF CO₂ ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Chapter summary:

CO₂ enhances photosynthesis and improves plant water use efficiency, thereby promoting plant growth. Global greening due to increased CO₂ levels in the atmosphere is well-established on all continents.

CO₂ absorption in sea water reduces the alkalinity of the oceans. The recent decline in alkalinity is within the range of natural variability on millennial time scales. Most ocean life evolved when the oceans were mildly acidic. Declining alkalinity might adversely affect corals, although the Australian Great Barrier Reef has shown considerable growth in recent years.

2.1 CO₂ and global greening

The growing CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere has the important positive effect of promoting plant growth by enhancing photosynthesis and improving water use efficiency. That is evident in the “global greening” phenomenon discussed below, as well as in the improving agricultural yields discussed in Chapter 10.

2.1.1 Measurement of global greening

“Greening” refers to an increase in the fraction of the Earth’s surface covered by plants. It can be quantified by the “Leaf Area Index” (LAI) measured by satellite. Many studies over the past decade have confirmed a global greening pattern (increase in LAI) attributable to rising CO₂ levels. Zhu *et al.* (2016) was one of the first studies to report that global greening was detectable using satellite sensors. From 1982 to 2011 they detected greening over 25-50% of the Earth versus “browning” over only 4% and attributed 70% of the greening to rising CO₂ levels (see Figure 2.1).

Zheng (2017) confirmed the pattern, noting that greening over thirty years had added 8% to global leaf area and that greening was mitigating warming. Greening has been observed globally but Chen *et al.* (2019) noted that China and India were exploiting it through land management changes. Thus, while China accounts for only 6.6% of global vegetated area it accounts for 25% of global net increase in LAI. Piao *et al.* (2020) noted that greening was even observable in the Arctic.

While plant models predict increased photosynthesis in response to rising CO₂, Haverd *et al.* (2020) reported a CO₂ fertilization rate nearly double what models had predicted. That is, CO₂ fertilization had driven an increase in observed global photosynthesis by 30% since 1900, versus 17% predicted by plant models. This indicates that global models of the socioeconomic impacts of rising CO₂ have likely understated the benefits to crops and agriculture. The connection between CO₂ fertilization and climate policy will be discussed in Chapter 10.




Figure 2.1: Trends in average Leaf Area Index (LAI). Source: Zhu et al. 2016 Figure 3.

Finally, Chen et al. (2024) surveyed claims that greening had slowed since 2000 due to drought stress. They found instead that faulty satellite sensors were the cause and that the corrected data showed accelerated greening over 55% of the globe while browning was accelerating over only 7%. In other words, the greening trend continued with no evidence of slowdown, and CO₂ fertilization remained the dominant driver

2.1.2 Photosynthesis and CO₂ levels

Plants build biomass through *photosynthesis*, a process that converts carbon dioxide, water, and light into sugar. The plant enzyme responsible for photosynthesis is called Ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate-carboxylase/oxygenase or “Rubisco”. Photosynthesis is initiated when CO₂ is available at the surface of the RuBisCo enzyme where it is converted to a molecule with 3 carbon atoms and thereafter incorporated into plant mass. This is referred to as the “C3” process.

Rubisco is estimated to have evolved about 3 billion years ago. Over geological time the Earth’s atmospheric CO₂ levels were usually many times higher than they are today, as shown in Figure 2.2.

About 400 million years ago CO₂ levels were an estimated 2,000-4,000 ppm and were at or above 1,000 ppm for much of the interval from 200 to 50 million years ago (Bernier 2006, Judd et al. 2024). Over the past 35 million years the level of atmospheric CO₂ has been steadily declining. During glaciations levels have fallen as low as 170 ppm (Gerhart and Ward 2010).




Figure 2.2. Ambient CO₂ levels over the past 550 million years. Today's concentration of 430 ppm is also shown. Source: (Berner 2006)

In response to low-CO₂ conditions some plants evolved another photosynthetic pathway called C₄, in which CO₂ is concentrated in the vicinity of Rubisco allowing for the C₃ process to function more efficiently. For agricultural purposes the plant categories are:

- C₃: rice, wheat, soybeans and most other crops
- C₄: maize (corn), sugar cane, millet, sorghum

Had atmospheric CO₂ levels continued declining, plant growth rates would have declined and eventually ceased. Below 180 ppm many C₃ species experience growth rate reductions on the order of 40-60% compared to their growth rates at 350 ppm (Gerhart and Ward 2010). C₃ plants have been observed under experimental conditions to stop growing altogether at levels between 60—140 ppm CO₂. Some C₄ plants are still able to grow at levels even as low as 10 ppm, albeit very slowly (Gerhart and Ward 2010).

Currently, CO₂ levels are about 420 ppm, up from 280 ppm in the early 1800s. The positive response of plants to extra CO₂ is illustrated in Figure 2.3 which is reproduced from Gerhart and Ward (2010). It shows the growth effect of CO₂ on Velvetleaf (*Abutilon theophrasti*) seedlings over 14 days under controlled conditions where only the CO₂ exposure is varied. The gains exhibited from increasing CO₂ from 150 ppm to 350 ppm continue under a further doubling to 700 ppm.




Figure 2.3: growth of *Abutilon theophrasti* after 14 days under identical conditions but for the indicated variations in CO₂ levels. Source: Gerhart and Ward (2010). Note “Current” corresponds to 1988 in image.

Over the past 60+ years there have been thousands of studies on the response of plants to rising CO₂ levels. The overwhelming theme is that plants, especially C3 plants, benefit from extra CO₂. There are two mechanisms by which CO₂ confers a growth benefit:

- Enhanced photosynthesis via the metabolic pathways described above.
- Increased water use efficiency. This arises because plants draw in CO₂ by opening the stomata (pores) on the leaf surface. When CO₂ is scarce the stomata must be kept wide open for long periods, which allows water to evaporate away. Under enriched CO₂ conditions the stomata are closed for longer periods helping the plant retain water longer, thereby increasing water use efficiency.

Specific effects of climate change on US agriculture will be reviewed in Chapter 10.

2.1.3 Rising CO₂ and crop water use efficiency

Derying et al. (2016) surveyed evidence on crop water productivity (CWP), the yield per unit of water used, drawing attention to the potential for CO₂ both to enhance photosynthesis and reduce leaf-level

transpiration (water loss during leaf respiration). They surveyed all available FACE data (Free Air CO₂ Enrichment—see Chapter 10) on crop yield changes for Maize (corn), Wheat, Rice and Soybean, and combined it with crop model data simulating yield responses as of 2080 under the extreme RCP8.5 scenario in four growing regions (Tropics, Arid, Temperate and Cold) each of which were split into rainfed and irrigated sub-regions. In every region they reported that models without CO₂ fertilization predicted CWP losses but CO₂ fertilization more than offset them so that all regions showed a net CWP gain. Deryng et al (2016) also reported that negative impacts of warming on wheat and soybean yields were fully offset by CWP gains and mitigated by up to 90% for rice and 60% for maize.

Similarly, Cheng et al. (2017) noted that increased global plant growth from 1982 to 2011 due to rising CO₂ uptake was accompanied by such large gains in CWP that despite the extra biomass global water use by plants had not increased.

Deryng et al. (2016) assumed that climate change would “exacerbate water scarcity”. It is noteworthy that while models predict drylands will expand under climate warming, current data show the opposite: greening is happening even in arid areas. Zhang et al. (2024) report that due to increased CO₂ levels “increasing aridity in drylands won’t lead to a general loss of vegetation productivity”; increased desertification will happen in at most 4% of currently arid areas.

2.1.4 CO₂ fertilization benefits in IPCC Reports

The IPCC has only minimally discussed global greening and CO₂ fertilization of agricultural crops. The topic is briefly acknowledged in a few places in the body of the IPCC 6th and earlier Assessment Reports but is omitted in all Summary documents. Section 2.3.4.3.3 of the AR6 Working Group I report entitled “global greening and browning” points out that the IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land had concluded with *high confidence* that greening had increased globally over the past 2-3 decades. It then discusses that there are variations in the greening trend among data sets, concluding that while they have *high confidence* greening has occurred, they have *low confidence* in the magnitude of the trend. There are also brief mentions of CO₂ fertilization effects and improvements in water use efficiency in a few other chapters in the AR6 Working Groups I and II Reports.

Overall, however, the Policymaker Summaries, Technical Summaries and Synthesis Reports fail to discuss the topic.

2.2 Ocean Alkalinity

2.2.1 Changing pH

A neutral aqueous solution has a pH of 7.0, while one with pH greater than 7.0 is basic and with pH less than 7.0 is acidic. The modern-day global average pH of sea water is estimated to be 8.04 (Copernicus Marine Service 2025), down from an estimated value of 8.2 in pre-Industrial times (Gattuso and Hansson, 2011). As CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere increase, more is absorbed by the oceans, which decreases alkalinity. Depending upon the buffering capacity of the oceans, the oceans are expected

to become somewhat less alkaline over time, consistent with the observed decrease in pH.




Figure 2.4: Ocean pH 1985 – 2022. Source: Copernicus Marine Service 2025

While this process is often called “ocean acidification”, it is a misnomer because the oceans are not expected to become acidic; “ocean neutralization” would be more accurate. Even if the water were to turn acidic, it is believed that life in the oceans evolved when the oceans were mildly acidic with pH 6.5 - to 7.0 (Krissansen-Totton et al., 2018). On the time scale of thousands of years, boron isotope proxy measurements of pH show that ocean pH was around 7.4 or 7.5 during the last glaciation (up to about 20,000 years ago) increasing to present-day values as the world warmed during deglaciation (Rae et al., 2018). Thus, there appears to be considerable resilience of ocean biota to natural long-term changes in ocean pH since marine organisms are exposed to wide ranges in pH anyway.

2.2.2 Coral reef changes

There are concerns that a decreasing pH of sea water will reduce the calcification rate of coral reefs. But coral reefs already endure large swings in pH, partly due to daily photosynthetic activity in the reef; measured pH values range from 9.4 during the day to 7.5 at night (Revelle and Fairbridge, 1957). De’ath et al. (2009) reported that a portion of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef (GBR, the world’s largest coral reef ecosystem) had experienced a 14% decline in calcification since 1990. This was tentatively attributed to increasing water temperature and decreasing pH. But Ridd et al. (2013) showed that report to have resulted from a biased data analysis which, when corrected, showed no change in calcification rates. Nevertheless, the alarm produced by the original paper has persisted as evidenced by the large number of published citations (541) received by the original study compared to only 11 citations for the correction (as of 30 April 2025).

The most recent annual summary of GBR conditions from the Australian Institute of Marine Science indicates a strong rebound has occurred in coral production (AIMS, 2023). Figure 2.5 shows the results of the AIMS surveys of hard coral cover, expressed as a percentage of the reef area. Much of the decline in the GBR before 2011 turned out to be due to intense tropical cyclone activity (Beeden et al., 2015) as well as a string of marine heatwaves, agricultural runoff and invasive species (Woods Hole, 2023). Given the reported declines in GBR calcification between 1990 and 2009 and the continued increase in atmospheric CO₂ levels the rebound has come as a surprise to some observers.




Figure 2.5 Hard coral cover of three regions of the Great Barrier Reef 1985 to 2023. Source: AIMS 2023.

It is being increasingly recognized that publication bias (alarming ocean acidification results preferred by high-impact research publications) exaggerates the impacts of declining ocean pH. An ICES Journal of Marine Science Special Issue addressed this problem with an article entitled, *Towards a Broader Perspective on Ocean Acidification Research*. In the Introduction to that Special Issue, H. I. Browman stated, “As is true across all of science, studies that report no effect of ocean acidification are typically more difficult to publish.” (Browman, 2016).

Similarly, a meta-analysis (Clements et al., 2021) of the negative effects of ocean acidification on reef fish behavior found what they called a “decline effect”: initially dramatic conclusions published in prominent journals showing apparently large reported effects of acidification tended to be followed up by subsequent studies on larger sample sizes yielding much smaller and typically non-existent effects. They call for their colleagues to improve research practices to prevent the “decline effect” from persisting:

[The] vast majority of studies with large effect sizes in this field tend to be characterized by low sample sizes, yet are published in high-impact journals and have a disproportionate influence on the field in terms of citations. We contend that ocean acidification has a negligible direct impact on fish behavior, and we advocate for improved approaches to minimize the potential for a decline effect in future avenues of research (Clements et al., 2021).

In summary, ocean life is complex and much of it evolved when the oceans were acidic relative to the present. The ancestors of modern coral first appeared about 245 million ago; as can be seen from Figure 2.2, CO₂ levels for more than 200 million years afterward were many times higher than they are today. Much of the public discussion of the effects of ocean “acidification” on marine biota has been one-sided and exaggerated. There is a known tendency for studies reporting dramatic effects on things like coral cover and fish behavior to get published in high-impact journals and receive widespread press coverage, then subsequent research rebutting those findings receives little attention.

References

- AR6: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- Australian Institute of Marine Science. (2022). Continued coral recovery leads to 36-year highs across two-thirds of the Great Barrier Reef. https://www.aims.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-08/AIMS_LTMP_Report_on%20GBR_coral_status_2021_2022_040822F3.pdf
- Beeden, R., Maynard, J., Puotinen, M., Marshall, P., Dryden, J., Goldberg, J., & Williams, G. (2015). Impacts and recovery from Severe Tropical Cyclone Yasi on the Great Barrier Reef. *PLOS ONE*, 10, e0121272. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121272>

- Berner, R. A. (2006). GEOCARBSULF: A combined model for Phanerozoic atmospheric O₂ and CO₂. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 70, 5653–5664.
- Browman, H. I. (2016). Applying organized scepticism to ocean acidification research. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 73(3), 529.1–536. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw010>
- Chen, C., Park, T., Wang, X., Piao, S., Xu, B., Chaturvedi, R. K., ... & Myneni, R. B. (2019). China and India lead in greening of the world through land-use management. *Nature Sustainability*, 2, 122–129. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-019-0220-7>
- Chen, X., Wang, Y., Liu, Y., & Piao, S. (2024). The global greening continues despite increased drought stress since 2000. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 49, e02791. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2351989423004262>
- Cheng, L., Zhang, L., Wang, Y. P., et al. (2017). Recent increases in terrestrial carbon uptake at little cost to the water cycle. *Nature Communications*, 8, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00114-5>
- Clements, J. C., Sundin, J., Clark, T. D., & Jutfelt, F. (2022). Meta-analysis reveals an extreme “decline effect” in the impacts of ocean acidification on fish behavior. *PLOS Biology*, 20(2), e3001511. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001511>
- Copernicus Marine Service. (2025). Global ocean acidification – Mean sea water pH time series and trend from multi-observations reprocessing. https://data.marine.copernicus.eu/product/GLOBAL_OMI_HEALTH_carbon_ph_area_averaged/description
- De'ath, G., Lough, J., & Fabricius, K. (2009). Declining coral calcification on the Great Barrier Reef. *Science*, 323, 116–119. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165283>
- Deryng, D., Conway, D., Ramankutty, N., Price, J., Warren, R., Jones, R., ... & Elliott, J. (2016). Regional disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO₂ concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nature Climate Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2995>
- Gattuso, J. P., & Hansson, L. (Eds.). (2011). *Ocean acidification: Background and history*. Oxford University Press.
- Gerhart, L. M., & Ward, J. K. (2010). Plant responses to low [CO₂] of the past. *New Phytologist*, 188, 674–695. <https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03441.x>
- Haverd, V., Raupach, M., Briggs, P., et al. (2020). Higher than expected CO₂ fertilization inferred from leaf to global observations. *Global Change Biology*, 26, 2390–2402.
- Hu, S. W. (2021). Response of rice yield traits to elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and its interaction with cultivar, nitrogen application rate and temperature: A meta-analysis of 20 years FACE studies. *Science of the Total Environment*, 764, 142797.
- Judd, E. J., Scotese, C. R., Young, S. A., et al. (2024). A 485-million-year history of Earth's surface temperature. *Science*, 385(6715). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adk3705>
- Krissansen-Totton, J., Arney, G. N., & Catling, D. C. (2018). Constraining the climate and ocean pH of the early Earth with a geological carbon cycle model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(6), 4105–4110. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721296115>
- Piao, S., Wang, X., Park, T., et al. (2020). Characteristics, drivers and feedbacks of global greening. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 1, 14–27.
- Rae, J. W. B., Burke, A., Robinson, L. F., et al. (2018). CO₂ storage and release in the deep Southern Ocean on millennial to centennial timescales. *Nature*, 562, 569–573. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0614-0>
- Revelle, R., & Fairbridge, R. W. (1957). Carbonate and carbon dioxide. In J. W. Hedgpeth (Ed.), *Treatise on marine ecology and paleoecology* (Vol. 1). *Geological Society of America*.
- Ridd, P., Silva, E., & Stieglitz, T. (2013). Have coral calcification rates slowed in the last twenty years? *Marine Geology*, 346, 392–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2013.09.002>
- Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. (2023). Is the Great Barrier Reef making a comeback? <https://www.whoi.edu/oceanus/feature/is-the-great-barrier-reef-making-a-comeback/>

- Zhang, Y., Liu, Y., Chen, X., et al. (2024). Less than 4% of dryland areas are projected to desertify despite increased aridity under climate change. *Nature Communications Earth & Environment*, 5. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01463-y>
- Zhu, Z., Piao, S., Myneni, R. B., et al. (2016). Greening of the Earth and its drivers. *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 791–795. <https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3004>

3 HUMAN INFLUENCES ON THE CLIMATE

Chapter Summary:

The global climate is naturally variable on all time scales. Anthropogenic CO₂ emissions add to that variability by changing the total radiative balance in the atmosphere.

The IPCC has downplayed the role of the sun in climate change but there are plausible solar irradiance reconstructions that imply it contributed to recent warming.

Climate projections are based on IPCC emission scenarios that have tended to exceed observed trends. The vast majority of academic climate “impacts” studies in recent years are based upon the extreme 8.5 scenario that is now considered implausible; its use as a business-as-usual scenario has been misleading.

Carbon cycle models connect annual emissions to growth in the atmospheric CO₂ stock. Models disagree over the rate of land and ocean CO₂ uptake but all agree that it has been increasing since 1959.

3.1 Components of radiative forcing and their history

3.1.1 Historical radiative forcing

A changing climate has been the norm throughout the Earth’s 4.6-billion-year history. The Earth’s temperature and weather patterns change naturally over timescales ranging from decades to millions of years. Natural variations in the surface climate originate in two ways. Internal climate fluctuations associated with circulations in the atmosphere and ocean produce exchanges of energy, water, and carbon between the atmosphere, oceans, land, and ice. External influences on the climate system include variations in the energy received from the sun and the effects of volcanic eruptions. Human activities influence climate through changing land use and land cover. Humans are also changing the composition of the atmosphere by emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases and by altering the concentration of aerosol particles in the atmosphere.

The earth is warmed by the sunlight it absorbs and is cooled by the radiative heat it emits to space. Averaged over the Earth’s surface, each of these processes involve power flows of about 240 Watts per square meter (W/m²). When they are in balance, there are no net external causes of warming or cooling. Both human and natural influences on the climate alter this balance and so cause the climate to change.

Influences on the Earth’s energy balance at the top of the atmosphere are quantified by “radiative forcing”, the extent to which they disturb the warming/cooling balance; a positive forcing warms while a negative forcing cools. The IPCC’s estimated history of major components of radiative forcing since 1750 is shown in the following two figures from its AR6.




Figure 3.1.1: IPCC estimates of radiative forcing components over time. Source: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/figures/chapter-2/figure-2-10/>




Figure 3.1.2 IPCC estimates of radiative forcing component changes from 1750 to 2019. Source: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/figures/chapter-7/figure-7-6/>

These graphs show that the total radiative forcing is comprised of both natural and anthropogenic components. Carbon dioxide is the largest human influence on the climate and the one most relevant to the influence of energy systems. It exerts a warming influence by decreasing the cooling power of the atmosphere. Emissions of CO_2 are accumulating in the atmosphere, as described in the following section, so that the warming influence is increasing. Other greenhouse gases (methane, nitrous oxide, halogens, and ozone) act similarly, currently adding another 75% to CO_2 's warming. Aerosols exert a cooling effect, although with large uncertainties in the way they catalyze the formation of reflective clouds. As a result, understanding the causes of recent warming requires not just identifying the warming effects of CO_2 , but also the more uncertain cooling effects of aerosols.

The IPCC views the change in the radiative forcing by the sun to be negligible, based on their preference for reconstructions that imply minimal solar change since preindustrial times. Connolly *et al.* (2021) reviewed sixteen different Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) reconstructions in the literature covering the 1600-2000 interval; they vary from almost no change in TSI to a relatively large upward trend. Those authors note that the variation in TSI reconstructions combined with variations in surface temperature reconstructions allows for inferences consistent with either no or most 20th Century warming being attributable to the sun.

A particularly thorny issue is the gap in TSI data between 1989 and 1991 due to a delay in the launch of a monitor following the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster on January 28 1986. This delay prevented a replacement satellite from being launched in time to overlap with, and its readings to be intercalibrated with, the prior system (Zacharias 2014, Scafetta et al. 2019). This is called the ACRIM (Active Cavity Radiometer Irradiance Monitor) gap problem. The question of whether there is an upward trend in TSI over 1978 to 2018 comes down to how the ACRIM data gap is filled. Connolly et al. (2021) found that the IPCC’s consensus statements on solar forcing were prematurely formulated through the suppression of dissenting scientific opinions.

The other natural radiative forcing component is largely volcanic aerosols, which exert an episodic cooling influence. Box 4.1 in the IPCC AR6 Report addresses the climate impact of volcanic eruptions, noting three explosive volcanic eruptions that occurred in the first half of the 19th century. This included the 1815 Tambora eruption that resulted in the ‘year without summer’, with multiple harvest failures across the Northern Hemisphere. There is uncertainty about the sign of the relatively small forcing due to the submarine volcano Hunga Tonga which erupted in 2022 (Jenkins et al. 2023, Schoeberl et al. 2024).

The anthropogenic forcing component was negligible before about 1900 and has increased steadily since, rising to almost 3 W/m² today. However, this is still only about 1 percent of the unperturbed radiation flows, making it a challenge to isolate the effects of anthropogenic forcing; state-of-the-art satellite estimates of global radiative energy flows are only accurate to a few W/m². Natural sources of global energy imbalance other than volcanoes and total solar irradiance (TSI) are not included in these graphs because they remain largely unknown.

3.1.2 Change in atmospheric CO₂ since 1958

Carbon dioxide’s warming influence depends upon how much “extra” CO₂ accumulates in the atmosphere- *i.e.*, its concentration above the preindustrial value of 280 ppm. The CO₂ level as recorded at the Mauna Loa observatory in Hawaii is generally used as the representative global average concentration. The data are available online at <https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/index.html>. The concentration was about 316 ppm at the start of the record in 1959 and is now about 430 ppm, a 36 percent increase. At the end of the last glaciation CO₂ levels had fallen to about 180 ppm. As discussed in Chapter 2 C3 plants begin dying at CO₂ levels below about 140 ppm and C4 plants at CO₂ levels below 100 ppm, so if CO₂ levels had continued falling plant life might have been in peril.




Fig. 3.1.3. CO₂: Yearly average atmospheric CO₂ concentrations (1959-2025) in ppm measured at Mauna Loa (blue). C3 Threshold: Level below which C3 plants begin dying (140 ppm, see Chapter 2). C4 Threshold: Level below which C4 plants begin dying (100 ppm, see Chapter 2). Glacial minimum: Minimum level during recent glaciations (purple arrow). CO₂ data source: <https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/index.html>

The annual increase in concentration is only about half of the CO₂ emitted because land and ocean processes currently absorb “excess” CO₂ at a rate approximately 50% of the human emissions. Future concentrations, and hence future human influences on the climate, therefore depend upon two components: (1) future rates of global human CO₂ emissions, and (2) how fast the land and ocean remove extra CO₂ from the atmosphere. We discuss each of these in turn.

3.2 Urbanization influence on temperature trends

Historical temperature data over land has been collected mainly where people live. This raises the problem of how to filter out non-climatic warming signals due to Urban Heat Islands (UHI) and other changes to the land surface. If they are not removed the data may over-attribute observed warming to greenhouse gases. The IPCC acknowledges that raw temperature data are contaminated with UHI effects but claims to have data cleaning procedures that remove them. It is an open question whether those procedures suffice for the purpose.

AR6 downplayed the issue by saying (WGI p. 235) that no recent evidence had emerged to alter the AR5 finding that urbanization causes an upward bias of no more than 10% in the global land surface warming trend. AR5 (WGI p. 189) also cited the 10% upper bound without citing a source. AR4 (WGI p. 244) cited Jones et al. (1990) and Peterson et al. (1999) as the basis of the claim. Peterson et al. had failed to find any difference in trends between rural and urban samples, although their definition of rural included local populations up to 10,000 persons and the relative influence of urbanization begins well below that (Spencer et al., 2025). Jones et al. compared rural/urban warming in three regions: Eastern Australia, Eastern China and Western Soviet Union. Their definition of “rural” included towns of up to 10,000 in the

former Soviet Union and up to 100,000 in China. They found relative warming biases greater than 10% in these areas but conjectured that the urbanization effect averaged over the areas they did not examine would bring the global land bias to under 10% of the observed warming trend.

Prior to the IPCC AR4 several papers appeared in print arguing that the warming effect of UHIs added a relatively large (30-50%) component to observed warming and was not simulated by climate models (de Laat and Maurellis 2006, McKittrick and Michaels 2007). These findings were based on correlations between locations of maximum warming over land with locations of maximum socioeconomic development. AR4 asserted (p. 244) that these correlations were an artefact of natural atmospheric circulations and were in fact statistically insignificant, and on that basis set the findings aside. The claim attracted controversy because it was presented with no supporting evidence. McKittrick (2010) and McKittrick and Nierenberg (2010) showed that taking into account various conjectured alternative explanations for the correlations did not affect their significance. The AR5 (p. 189) conceded that the AR4 had provided “no explicit evidence” for its assessment and further acknowledged, based on these papers, that there was “significant evidence for such contamination of the record” i.e. a warming bias in the land record. However as noted, elsewhere in the report they carried forward the AR4 claim that it was less than 10% of observed warming and they expressed no caution against using the land record for climate measurement on the assumption that it is not contaminated with UHI bias. Recently Soon et al. (2023) estimated an urbanization bias in the Northern Hemisphere land record over 1850-2018 sufficient to increase the trend in the blended record from 0.55°C to 0.89°C per century.

Some studies providing evidence against UHI contamination compared warming rates between rural and urban locations (Jones et al. 1990, Peterson et al. 1999, Wickham et al. 2013). It is not known whether such methods would be capable of detecting UHI bias even when present. The influence of UHI warming is logarithmic, in other words it is strongest at low population growth levels then tapers off as local urbanization expands (Oke 1973, Spencer et al. 2025). Hence finding the same or more warming in rural areas than in nearby urban areas is consistent either with UHI bias being absent or present. McKittrick (2013) provided an empirical demonstration in which the rural/urban trends were not significantly different in a data set shown on other grounds to be contaminated with UHI bias.

Parker (2006) instead examined a sample of urban locations and found no difference in trends between subsets partitioned according to nighttime wind speed, concluding on this basis that urbanization could not be a significant factor. Here again the question is whether such a method would find UHI bias even if present. McKittrick (2013) presented an example in which UHI-contaminated data did not exhibit significant trend differences when stratified according to wind speed.

The challenge in measuring UHI bias is relating local temperature change to a corresponding change in population or urbanization, rather than to a static classification variable such as rural or urban. Spencer et al. (2025) use newly-available historical population archives to undertake such an analyses and found evidence of significant UHI bias in US summertime temperature data.

In summary while there is clearly warming in the land record, there is also evidence that it is biased upward by patterns of urbanization and that these biases are not removed by the data processing algorithms used to produce climate data sets.

3.3 Future emission scenarios and the carbon cycle

3.3.1 Emission scenarios

Because of the great uncertainties about these many factors in the decades to come, Assessing the dangers of future GHG emissions requires assumptions about what those emissions will be. Future emissions, and hence human influences on the climate, will depend upon future demographics, economic

activity, regulation, and energy and agricultural technologies. Various assumptions about each of those lead to projections of greenhouse gas emissions and concentrations, aerosol concentrations, and changes in land use, which ultimately can be combined into assumptions about anthropogenic radiative forcing.

Instead of making precise predictions of future concentrations, the IPCC has created various sets of scenarios meant to span a plausible range of possibilities for population, economy, and technologies. Recent versions of the scenarios are labeled by a number indicating the anthropogenic radiative forcing expected in 2100 under that scenario. Thus, a scenario labeled with a “6” corresponds to 6 W/m² of human-induced radiative forcing (warming) at the end of the century. (Recall current anthropogenic radiative forcing is about 2.7 W/m².)

Although the IPCC does not claim its emission scenarios are forecasts, they are often treated as such. Comparisons of past scenario groups against observations show a tendency for IPCC emission projections to overstate actual subsequent emissions. For the IPCC Third and Fourth Assessment Reports a set of emission projections from the *Special Report on Emission Scenarios* was used; these were referred to as the SREP scenarios. McKittrick *et al.* (2012) showed that, when converted to per capita values, the SREP scenario emissions distribution was skewed upwards and incompatible with observed trends. McKittrick and Wood (2013) further showed that global energy market dynamics constrained global per capita CO₂ emissions to an extent not reflected in IPCC scenarios. The bias of the SRES scenarios was confirmed by the later analysis of Hausfather *et al.* (2019) who showed (Figure 3.3.1) that observed atmospheric CO₂ concentrations tracked the low end of the SRES range and also of subsequent IPCC scenario ranges.

For AR5 the IPCC developed a new set of scenarios called the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). These were identified by a number representing the increase in forcing and were thus called RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP6.0 and RCP8.5. RCP2.6 (implying an anthropogenic radiative forcing in 2100 of 2.6 W/m²) projects a GHG concentration pathway leading to warming well below 2°C. At the other end of the scale RCP8.5 is an extreme outcome implying nearly 5°C warming just in this century.

RCP8.5 came to be referred to as the no-policy baseline, or “business-as-usual” scenario in both the academic literature and popular media. It was therefore used to generate the reference outcome supposedly representing the 21st century world in the absence of increasingly stringent emission reduction policies. But RCP8.5 was intended as a low-probability high emissions scenario and its use as a business-as-usual baseline has been criticized as grossly misleading.¹ Hausfather and Peters (2020) writing in a commentary in *Nature* magazine, pointed out that RCP8.5 was developed as an extreme worst-case, and its misuse as a “business as usual” baseline has resulted in a large number of misleading studies and media reporting.

The implausibility of the RCP8.5 scenario was examined by Burgess *et al.* (2021). They noted that RCP8.5 has already diverged from observed trends in energy use and the near future trends diverge sharply from those of the International Energy Agency (IEA), which provides market-based projections of energy use for the coming decades. The IEA trends, which are based on plausible extrapolations of current economic and demographic trends, run below the entire envelope of RCP projections, implying not only that RCP8.5 is dubious, but that even lower emission scenarios are looking unlikely.

Widespread use of RCP8.5 has created an alarmist bias in the climate impacts literature. The extent of this problem was confirmed in a literature analysis by Pielke Jr. and Ritchie (2020). They found that some 16,800 scientific papers published between 2010 and 2020 used the RCP8.5 scenario, with about 4,500 of the articles linking RCP8.5 to the concept of “business-as-usual”. Their analysis showed how RCP8.5 was misused not only by individual researchers, but also by influential science agencies like the IPCC and the US National Climate Assessment (USNCA), which has directly led to misleading coverage in prominent media outlets.

¹ This extreme scenario is useful for modelers, since a large forcing generates a large response (warming) making it easier to assess a model’s sensitivity. But that’s very different than claiming it is a plausible future.




Figure 3.3.1 Comparison of observed atmospheric CO₂ levels (black line) with scenario projections (colored lines, mainly IPCC) since the 1970s. Source: Hausfather et al. (2019) Figure S4.

Pielke and Ritchie (2020) reported new studies using RCP8.5 were published at a rate of about 20 per day, with about two per day specifically linking RCP8.5 and “business as usual.” They conclude that the climate research community has spent a decade “committing scientific resources to science fiction” and that “The scientific literature has become imbalanced in an apocalyptic direction.”

The IPCC developed a new set of scenarios for AR6, the “Shared Socioeconomic Pathway” (SSP) scenarios, which have continued the bias shown in the RCP and SRES scenarios. Figure 3.3.2 shows total global observed CO₂ emissions compiled by the International Energy Agency (IEA) merged with the emission projection from the IEA taking account of energy use projections and current policies. The other lines show the range of IPCC SSP scenarios (SSP1-SSP5). As of 2023, global CO₂ emissions have been tracking well below SSP3 and higher.




Figure 3.3.2. Observed and projected CO₂ emissions. Source: IPCC (SSP scenarios) and Energy Information Administration (EIA). Green: observed historical emissions and EIA projections. Other lines: SSP1-5. Data source: Friedlingstein et al. (2024).

3.3.2 The carbon cycle relating emissions and concentrations

Carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning (and to a lesser extent land use [biomass burning] and cement production) have led to steadily increasing CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere, as shown in Fig. 3.1.3. The relation between emissions and concentration is determined by the global carbon cycle of land and ocean processes that exchange carbon with the atmosphere. Our understanding of these processes was reviewed by Crisp et al. (2021).

There are about 850 Gt of carbon (GtC) in the Earth's atmosphere², almost all of it in the form of CO₂. Each year, biological processes (plant growth and decay) and physical processes (ocean absorption and outgassing) exchange about 200 GtC of that carbon with the Earth's surface (roughly 80 GtC with the land and 120 GtC with the oceans). Before human activities became significant, removals from the atmosphere

² Because CO₂ is chemically transformed through the course of the carbon cycle, it is more convenient to track atoms of carbon rather than molecules of CO₂. One gigatonne of carbon (GtC) is equivalent to about 3.7 Gt of CO₂.

were roughly in balance with additions. But burning fossil fuels (coal, oil, and gas) takes carbon out of the ground and adds it to the annual exchange. That addition (together with a much smaller contribution from cement manufacturing) amounted to 10.3 GtC in 2023, or only about 5 percent of the annual exchange.

The carbon cycle accommodates about 50 percent of humanity’s small annual injection of carbon into the air by naturally sequestering it through plant growth and oceanic uptake, while the remainder accumulates in the atmosphere (Ciais et al., 2013). For that reason, the annual increase in atmospheric CO₂ concentration averages only about half of that naively expected from human emissions.

To project future CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere, and hence future human influences on the climate, it is important to know how the carbon cycle might change in the future. The historical near-constancy of that 50% fraction means that the more CO₂ humanity has produced, the faster nature removed it from the atmosphere. That 50% fraction changes somewhat from year to year due to natural carbon cycle imbalances from El Nino, La Nina, and varying weather patterns. There was also a substantial additional reduction in atmospheric CO₂ after the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo, a curious result that has yet to be explained (Angert et al., 2004).

The main processes that remove excess CO₂ from the atmosphere are increased growth of land vegetation (especially at high latitudes), some increase in the sequestering of carbon in soils, and uptake of CO₂ by the ocean due to the increasing partial pressure of atmospheric CO₂ over that of CO₂ dissolved in the ocean. All twenty land carbon cycle models tracked by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein et al., 2024) show land processes have been removing excess CO₂ at an increasing rate since 1959. This is consistent with a “global greening” phenomenon (Chapter 2.1) observed by satellites since monitoring of global greenness began in the 1982.

While land vegetation has been responding positively to more atmospheric CO₂, uptake of extra CO₂ by ocean biological processes remains too uncertain to be measured reliably. Our current understanding of these and many more carbon cycle processes was reviewed by Crisp *et al.* (2021).

CO₂ uptake by land processes

The uptake of extra CO₂ from the atmosphere by land surface processes (as also inferred from global greening) has been modeled with 20 different dynamic global vegetation models, the outputs of which are updated every year by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein, 2024). As seen in Fig. 3.3.3, all of those models agree that vegetation and soils have been sequestering carbon from the atmosphere. But we also see that the long-term trends over 1959 to 2023 (65 years) vary widely between models, by nearly a factor of 7. This demonstrates that there remains considerable uncertainty regarding how fast CO₂ from the atmosphere is being removed by land processes, which in turn translates into uncertainty regarding future atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. Those uncertain future CO₂ concentrations then imply a source of uncertainty in climate model simulations of future climate change.




Figure 3.3.3 Decadal trends in the yearly CO₂ uptake by land processes during 1959-2023 simulated by 20 different dynamic global vegetation models periodically reported by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein, 2024).

CO₂ uptake by ocean processes

The uptake of extra CO₂ from the atmosphere by ocean processes has been modeled with 10 different dynamic global vegetation models, the outputs of which are updated every year by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein, 2024). Like the results from the land models, all of the ocean models agree that the global oceans have been sequestering carbon from the atmosphere at an increasing rate during 1959-2023 (Fig. 3.3.4). Unlike the land models, however, the ocean models show much better agreement with each other, with the model producing the fastest increasing CO₂ uptake being only 65% faster than the model with the most slowly increasing CO₂ uptake. In spite of the relative agreement among models, Friedlingstein et al. (2022) notes that there is also substantial discrepancy between the different methods on the strength of the ocean sink over the last decade, particularly in the Southern Ocean.

Note that the average trend in CO₂ uptake across all land models in Fig. 3.3.3 is 25% larger than the average trend in ocean uptake. This suggests land processes are increasing in their ability to remove CO₂ faster than ocean processes are increasing their CO₂ sequestration.




Figure 3.3.5 Decadal trends in the yearly CO₂ uptake by ocean processes during 1959-2023 simulated by 10 different ocean biogeochemistry models periodically reported by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein, 2024).

References

- Angert, A., S. Biraud, Bonfils, C., Buermann, W. and I. Fung (2004). CO₂ seasonality indicates origins of post-Pinatubo sink. *Geophysical Research Letters* 31. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GL019760>
- AR6: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- AR5: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fifth Assessment Report* (2011) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- AR4: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report* (2007) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- Burgess, Matthew et al (2021) *Environmental Research Letters* 16 014016 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abcdd2/meta>

- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, et al. (2013): Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA
- Connolly, Roman, Willie Soon, Michael Connolly et al. (2021) How much has the Sun influenced Northern Hemisphere temperature trends? An ongoing debate *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 21(6) doi: 10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131>
- Crisp, David & Dolman, Han (A.J.) & Tanhua, Toste & Mckinley, Galen & Hauck, Judith & Bastos, Ana & Sitch, Stephen & Eggleston, Simon & Aich, Valentin. (2022). How Well Do We Understand the Land-Ocean-Atmosphere Carbon Cycle?. *Reviews of Geophysics*. 60. 10.1029/2021RG000736.
- De Laat, A.T.J., and A.N. Maurellis (2006), Evidence for influence of anthropogenic surface processes on lower tropospheric and surface temperature trends, *International Journal of Climatology* 26:897—913.
- Friedlingstein, P., and 95 co-authors (2024): Global Carbon Budget 2024, *Earth System Science Data* 14(4), <https://essd.copernicus.org/preprints/essd-2024-519>
- Hausfather et al. (2019) “Evaluating the Performance of Past Climate Model Projections” *Geophysical Research Letters* 47(1) <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085378>
- Hausfather, Z. and G. Peters (2020) “Emissions – the ‘business as usual’ story is misleading” *Nature* 29 January 2020 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-00177-3>
- Jenkins, S., Smith, C., Allen, M. et al. Tonga eruption increases chance of temporary surface temperature anomaly above 1.5 °C. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 13, 127–129 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01568-2>
- Jones, P. D., P. Y. Groisman, M. Coughlan, N. Plummer, W.-C. Wang, and T. R. Karl (1990), Assessment of urbanization effects in time series of surface air temperature over land, *Nature*, 347, 169 – 172
- Liu, Pengfei et al. (2021) “Improved estimates of preindustrial biomass burning reduce the magnitude of aerosol climate forcing in the Southern Hemisphere” *Science Advances* 7(22) May 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc1379>
- McKittrick, R.R. and P.J. Michaels (2007), Quantifying the influence of anthropogenic surface processes and inhomogeneities on gridded global climate data, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112, D24S09, doi:10.1029/2007JD008465.
- McKittrick, Ross and Joel Wood (2013) Co-fluctuation patterns of per capita carbon dioxide emissions: The role of energy markets. *Energy Economics* 39 pp. 1-12 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0140988313000649>
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2010) Atmospheric Oscillations Do Not Explain the Temperature-Industrialization Correlation. *Statistics Politics and Policy* Vol 1. No. 1., July 2010
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2013) Encompassing Tests of Socioeconomic Signals in Surface Climate Data. *Climatic Change* doi 10.1007/s10584-013-0793-5. Volume 120, Issue 1-2. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10584-013-0793-5>
- McKittrick, Ross R. and Nicolas Nierenberg (2010) Socioeconomic Patterns in Climate Data. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, 35(3,4) pp. 149-175. DOI 10.3233/JEM-2010-0336
- McKittrick, Ross R., Mark Strazicich and Junsoo Lee (2012) “Long-Term Forecasting of Global Carbon Dioxide Emissions: Reducing Uncertainties Using a Per-Capita Approach.” *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol 32, Issue 5, pp 435-451 DOI: 10.1002/for.2248.
- Oke, T.R., 1973: City size and the urban heat island, *Atmospheric Environment* 7, 769-779
- Parker, D.E. (2006) “A Demonstration that Large-Scale Warming is not Urban.” *Journal of Climate* 19:2882—2895.
- Peterson, Thomas C., Kevin P. Gallo, Jay Lawrimore, Timothy W. Owen, Alex Huang, David A. McKittrick (1999) Global rural temperature trends. *Geophysical Research Letters* February 1999 <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998GL900322>

- Pielke, Roger and Ritchie, Justin (2020) “Systemic Misuse of Scenarios in Climate Research and Assessment” Social Sciences Research Network April 2020, available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3581777>
- Scaffeta, Nicola, Richard C. Willson, Jae N. Lee and Dong Wu (2019) Modeling Quiet Solar Luminosity Variability from TSI Satellite Measurements and Proxy Models during 1980–2018. *Remote Sensing* 11(21) 2569 <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11212569>
- Schoeberl, M.R., Y. Wang, G. Taha, D.J. Zawada, R. Ueyama and A. Dessler, 2024. Evolution of the climate forcing during the two years after the Hunga Tonga-Hunga Ha’apai eruption. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 129.
- Soon, W.; Connolly, R.; Connolly, M.; Akasofu, S.-I.; Baliunas, S.; et al. (2023) The Detection and Attribution of Northern Hemisphere Land Surface Warming (1850–2018) in Terms of Human and Natural Factors: Challenges of Inadequate Data. *Climate* 2023, 11, 179. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli11090179>
- Spencer, Roy W, John R Christy and William D. Braswell (2025) Urban Heat Island Effects in U.S. Summer Surface Temperature Data, 1895–2023 *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology* April 2025 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-23-0199.1>
- Wickham C, R Rohde, RA Muller, J Wurtele, J Curry, et al. (2013) Influence of Urban Heating on the Global Temperature Land Average using Rural Sites Identified from MODIS Classifications. *Geoinformatics and Geostatistics: An Overview* 1:2.
- Zacharias, Pia (2014) An Independent Review of Existing Total Solar Irradiance Records. *Surveys in Geophysics* 35 pp. 897—912 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10712-014-9294-y>

PART II: CLIMATE RESPONSE TO CO₂ EMISSIONS

4 CLIMATE SENSITIVITY TO CO₂ FORCING

Chapter Summary

There is growing recognition that climate models are not fit for the purpose of determining the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS) of the climate to increasing CO₂. The IPCC has turned to data-driven approaches using historical data and paleoclimate reconstructions, but their reliability is diminished by data inadequacies.

Data-driven ECS estimates tend to be lower than climate model-generated values. The IPCC AR6 upper bound for the likely range of ECS is 4.0°C, lower than the AR5 value of 4.5°C. This lowering of the upper bound seems well justified by paleoclimatic data. The IPCC AR6 lower bound for the likely range of ECS is 2.5°C, substantially higher than the AR5 value of 1.5°C. This raising of the lower bound is more weakly justified. Evidence since the AR6 finds the lower bound of the likely range to be around 1.8°C.

4.1 Introduction

The climate’s response to increasing concentrations of CO₂ is central to the scientific debate on anthropogenic climate change, and so also to the public debate on “climate action.” The simplest measure of that response is the rise in the global average surface temperature, quantified by the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS). ECS is defined as the amount of warming expected in response to a doubling of CO₂ from its pre-industrial concentration of 280 ppm, after all climate components have had time to adjust. Some components, like temperatures in the lower atmosphere (troposphere), adjust rapidly, while others such as the deep ocean and cryosphere might take as long as centuries. A related measure, the Transient Climate Response (TCR), better describes the shorter time scales; it is defined as the amount of warming when the CO₂ concentration is doubled by rising one percent annually for 70 years.

The 1979 Charney Report for the US National Academy of Sciences (National Research Council 1979) proposed that the most likely ECS was $3.0 \pm 1.5^\circ\text{C}$. The IPCC repeatedly reaffirmed that range with only minor variations until its most recent AR6. AR5 termed 1.5–4.5°C as the *likely* range (66 percent probability) and stated that ECS is *extremely unlikely* (95 percent probability) to be below 1.0°C and very unlikely (90 percent probability) to exceed 6.5°C.

The uncertainty in ECS has remained stubbornly wide, despite many individual studies that claimed to narrow it (Hausfather 2023). Most recently, AR6 narrowed the *likely* range to 2.5–4.0°C and deemed the *very likely* range to be 2.0–5.0°C. This narrowing on the low end is disputed, as will be discussed below.

Uncertainties in ECS are highly consequential for policy making. As will be discussed in Chapter 11, economic models use ECS values to project the costs of CO₂ emissions. The traditional value (3.0 °C) has typically yielded modest global social costs of CO₂ emissions, sufficient to justify some policy actions, but mostly deferred to later in this century. If ECS is very high (above 4.5°C) immediate aggressive emission controls become more imperative, whereas no CO₂ emission controls are economically justifiable for ECS below 2.0°C (Dayaratna et al. 2016, 2020). Obtaining a precise estimate is impossible, so policy making needs to account for the uncertainty.

Climate scientists use multiple lines of evidence to determine the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity:

- Climate model simulations
- Historical observations
- Paleoclimatic observations

- Process understanding of feedbacks

By itself, the equilibrium warming effect of a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ is slightly more than 1°C (Soden and Held 2006). Larger values of ECS arise from positive feedbacks that amplify the CO₂ warming. Water vapor feedback is positive: a warmer atmosphere may have more water vapor, which itself is a powerful greenhouse gas. Warmer temperatures also result in less snow and sea ice cover, allowing the Earth to absorb more of the sun’s radiation. Some simple estimates of these feedbacks increase the ECS to around 2°C (Sherwood et al., 2020).

Values of ECS above 2°C arise primarily from positive cloud feedbacks whose magnitude, and even sign, are highly uncertain. Elements of cloud feedback include changes in the latitudinal distribution of clouds, changes in the distribution of cloud height (changes in low versus high clouds), changes to the phase of clouds (ice versus liquid), changes in cloud particle size (associated with changes in concentration and/or composition of aerosol particles), changes in the precipitation efficiency of clouds, and even changes in how clouds are distributed over the daily solar cycle (Curry and Webster, 1999). It is difficult for climate models to simulate any of these processes correctly owing to their small scale, let alone predict how they will change in the future. Further, cloud processes modulate the magnitudes of the water vapor, lapse rate, and the surface albedo feedbacks.

4.2 Model-based estimates of climate sensitivity

The ECS ranges given in IPCC AR4 and AR5 were obtained primarily by examining the behaviour of large-scale climate models, also called General Circulation Models (GCMs). However, the IPCC changed course in its AR6 when it turned to a more direct data-driven methodology. Here we discuss some of the pitfalls of using GCMs to try to determine the Earth’s climate sensitivity.

ECS is an emergent property of climate models—that is, it is not directly parameterized or tuned. Historically, collections of parameterizations have been chosen to produce an expected value of climate sensitivity, particularly with regards to sub-grid-scale cloud processes, particularly in AR4 and to a lesser extent in AR5. Otherwise plausible GCMs and parameter selections have been discarded because of perceived conflict with this warming rate, or aversion to a model’s climate sensitivity being outside an accepted range. For example, even in a CMIP6 model, Mauritsen and Roeckner (2020) state the following regarding their Max Planck Institute climate model (emphasis added):

“We have documented how we tuned the MPI-ESM1.2 global climate model to match the instrumental record of warming; an endeavor which has clearly been successful. Due to the historical order of events, the choice was to do this practically by *targeting an ECS of about 3 K using cloud feedbacks*, as opposed to tuning the aerosol forcing.”

In other words, the modelers chose an ECS value of 3°C and then tuned the cloud parameterizations to match their intended result.

Direct warming from CO₂ doubling is only about 1°C (Hall and Manabe 1997); further warming arises from climate feedbacks that are not explicitly resolved by the GCM but rely on parameterizations of physical processes. Higher values of ECS arise primarily from assumed positive cloud feedbacks, whereas the magnitude and even the sign of the feedbacks are very uncertain. Elements of cloud feedback include changes in the latitudinal distribution of clouds, changes in the distribution of cloud height (changes in low versus high clouds), changes to the phase of clouds (ice versus liquid), changes in cloud particle size (associated with changes in concentration and/or composition of aerosol particles), changes in the precipitation efficiency of clouds, and even changes in how clouds are distributed over the daily solar cycle (Curry and Webster, 1999). It is difficult for GCMs to simulate any of these processes correctly owing to

their small scale, let alone predict how they will change in the future. Further, cloud processes modulate the magnitudes of the water vapor, lapse rate, and the surface albedo feedbacks.

ECS can be determined from climate model simulations by doubling the concentration of CO₂ and allowing several centuries for the warming to equilibrate. To avoid the necessity of long simulations, “effective climate sensitivity” is commonly evaluated from a 150-year simulation in response to a sudden quadrupling of CO₂.

The spread of ECS values from the CMIP5 ensemble of climate models used in the AR5 was 2.0–4.7°C; that range increased for the CMIP6 models used in the AR6 to between 1.8 and 5.7°C (Chen et al., 2021, Scafetta 2021, see Figure 5.1). Far from settling the model-based sensitivity of climate system uncertainties appear to be growing. The main cause of the overall upward shift in ECS in CMIP6 relative to CMIP5 is a larger positive cloud feedback, driven by changes to the cloud parameterizations in many CMIP6 models (Zelinka et al., 2020)




Figure 4.1 Equilibrium Climate Sensivities in °C of 37 climate models from the CMIP6 ensemble. Identifiers for the various models appear along the horizontal axis. From (Scafetta, 2021) <https://www.mdpi.com/2225-1154/9/11/161>

Because of concerns about model tuning and the high sensitivity to cloud parameterizations, the IPCC AR6 (2021) did not rely on climate model simulations in their assessment of climate sensitivity, relying instead on other methods, chiefly a recent empirical estimate.

4.3 Data-driven estimates of climate sensitivity

Climate sensitivity can also be estimated from instrumental records of surface temperatures and ocean heat content, combined with estimates of how climate forcings (e.g., greenhouse gases, solar, volcanoes, aerosols) have changed in the past (Otto et al., 2013). Using this information, a simple empirical model called an Energy Balance Model can be employed. It requires estimating a feedback parameter whose uncertainties are highly amplified in the resulting ECS (Roe and Baker, 2007).

The accuracy of the data-driven methods depends on the quality of the input data. Assumptions are needed about ocean heat storage, and the ocean data is inadequate. The greatest source of uncertainty is the amount and composition of aerosol particles and their interactions with cloud radiative properties (the so-called aerosol indirect effect). Climate models exhibit warming in response to GHGs but cooling in response to aerosols (Schwartz et al., 2007). Observed 20th century warming can be shown to be consistent either with low ECS and low aerosol cooling, or high ECS and high aerosol cooling. Since fossil fuel use adds both GHGs and aerosols to the atmosphere, both effects need to be estimated to isolate the warming effect of CO₂. Over time, the IPCC’s estimate of the cooling effect of aerosols has declined (Lewis, 2023).

Paleoclimate proxies are also used to evaluate the sensitivity of past climates, by comparing paleoclimate changes in the Earth’s temperatures to estimates of changes in forcings. The two most informative periods are the last glacial maximum (around 20,000 years ago), which was about 3–7°C colder than today, and a mid-Pliocene period (roughly three million years ago), which was 1–3°C warmer than today. The limits on cooling during the last glacial maximum give the best single evidence that high values of climate sensitivity are unlikely. However, paleoclimate estimates are associated with very large uncertainties in the estimated temperatures and forcings. Further, estimates of climate sensitivity based on past climate states may not be representative of the current state of the climate system.

A recurring theme in the climate literature is that ECS estimates based on historical data are smaller than ECS estimates inferred from climate models (Sherwood and Forest 2024). About 15 estimates based on historical data appeared in the peer-reviewed literature between 2012 and 2024 yielding ECS best estimates between 1.0°C and 2.5°C, although critics have questioned some of the methods and the data quality. For the AR6, the IPCC placed primary weight on the results of Sherwood et al. (2020) that combined historical and paleoclimate proxies with the process-based approach and yielded a best estimate of 3.1°C with a *likely* range of 2.6–3.9°C. Lewis (2022) raised a number of concerns about this result, including methodological errors, outdated input values, and use of subjective versus objective Bayesian priors in the analysis. Lewis’ analysis found that climate sensitivity is estimated to be much lower and better constrained than in the Sherwood et al. analysis – median 2.2°C (1.8–2.7°C in the 17–83 percent *likely* range, and 1.6–3.2°C in the 5–95 percent *very likely* range). The IPCC AR6 estimated only a 5 percent probability that ECS was below 2.3°C, whereas Lewis estimated it to be over 50 percent. The most recent publications on the debate between Sherwood et al. and Lewis further defend their respective positions: Sherwood and Foster (2024) and Lewis (2025).

An argument emphasized in AR6 is that data-driven ECS estimates might understate the future warming response to GHGs because of a so-called “pattern effect” (Forster et al., 2021). The tropical Pacific is believed to strongly influence the overall efficiency with which the Earth radiates heat to space, but some regions remove heat more efficiently than others. If the west-to-east temperature gradient in the tropical Pacific is weakened in a warming climate, warming would concentrate where heat is less efficiently removed, raising ECS.

Most climate models simulate that rising GHGs will weaken the east-west temperature gradient, which led the IPCC in the AR6 to conclude that data-driven ECS estimates understated the *future* ECS value. However, Seager et al. (2019) pointed out that, contrary to models, the east-west temperature gradient has been strengthening over time. They further argued that the mechanism predicting otherwise in climate models was based on a faulty characterization of oceanic dynamics and there is no reason to expect the gradient to weaken. A similar argument was recently made by Lee et al. (2024), who concluded that “the

trajectory of the observed trend reflects the response to increasing GHG loading in the atmosphere”; in other words, GHG warming should lead to a future strengthening rather than a weakening of the temperature gradient. Increased efficiency of atmospheric cooling implies, if anything, that the future ECS in a warming climate may be *lower* than current estimates.

4.4 Transient Climate Response

The Transient Climate Response (TCR) provides a more useful observational constraint on climate sensitivity. TCR is the amount of warming that results when CO₂ is increased at an annual rate of 1 percent over a period of 70 years (i.e., doubled gradually). Relative to the ECS, observationally determined values of TCR avoid the problems of uncertainties in ocean heat uptake and the fuzzy boundary in defining equilibrium arising from a range of timescales for the longer-term feedback processes (e.g., ice sheets). TCR is more generally related to peak warming and better constrained by historical warming, than ECS. IPCC AR6 judged the *very likely* range of TCR to be 1.2–2.4°C. In contrast to ECS, the upper bound of TCR is more tightly constrained. For comparison, the TCR values determined by Lewis (2023) are 1.25 to 2.0°C, showing much better agreement with the AR6 values than was seen in a comparison of the ECS values.

As will be discussed in Chapter 6, a real-world ECS smaller than the model average is supported by studies that show climate models on average overestimate the observed surface and troposphere warming over the past 50 years. Lower sensitivities also align with evidence from consistent fingerprinting (Section 8), where model responses need to be downscaled to align with observed trends.

References

- Carbon Brief. (2020, July 22). Explainer: How scientists estimate climate sensitivity. <https://www.carbonbrief.org/explainer-how-scientists-estimate-climate-sensitivity>
- Carbon Brief. (2020, July 22). Guest post: Why low-end ‘climate sensitivity’ can now be ruled out. <https://www.carbonbrief.org/guest-post-why-low-end-climate-sensitivity-can-now-be-ruled-out>
- Carbon Brief. (2021, August 9). In-depth Q&A: The IPCC’s sixth assessment report on climate science. <https://www.carbonbrief.org/in-depth-qa-the-ipccs-sixth-assessment-report-on-climate-science>
- Chen, D., et al. (2021). Framing, context, and methods. In V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Curry, J. A., & Webster, P. J. (1999). Thermodynamic feedbacks in the climate system. In *Thermodynamics of atmospheres and oceans* (pp. 351–385). Academic Press.
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and David Kreutzer (2017) Empirically-Constrained Climate Sensitivity and the Social Cost of Carbon. *Climate Change Economics* April 2017 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S2010007817500063>
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and Patrick J. Michaels (2020) Climate Sensitivity, Agricultural Productivity and the Social Cost of Carbon in FUND. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00263-w>
- Forster, P., et al. (2021). The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hausfather, Z. (2020, July 22). Explainer: How scientists estimate climate sensitivity. Carbon Brief. <https://www.carbonbrief.org/explainer-how-scientists-estimate-climate-sensitivity>

- Lan, X., Tans, P., & Thoning, K. W. (2025). Trends in globally-averaged CO₂ determined from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory measurements. NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory. <https://doi.org/10.15138/9N0H-ZH07>
- Lee, S., Byrne, M. P., Loikith, P. C., & O'Dell, C. W. (2024). Zonal contrasts of the tropical Pacific climate predicted by a global constraint. *Climate Dynamics*, 62(1–2), 229–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-023-06741-7>
- Lewis, N. (2023). Objectively combining climate sensitivity evidence. *Climate Dynamics*, 61(9–10), 3155–3163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06398-8>
- Lewis, N. (2025). Comment on “Can uncertainty in climate sensitivity be narrowed further?” by Sherwood and Forest (2024). *EGUsphere* [preprint]. <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-1179>
- Mauritsen, T., & Roeckner, E. (2020). Tuning the MPI-ESM1.2 global climate model to improve the match with instrumental record warming by lowering its climate sensitivity. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 12, e2019MS002037. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS002037>
- Otto, A., Otto, F. E. L., Boucher, O., Church, J., Hegerl, G., Forster, P. M., Gregory, J. M., & Johnson, G. C. (2013). Energy budget constraints on climate response. *Nature Geoscience*, 6(6), 415–416. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1836>
- Pachauri, R. K., & Meyer, L. (Eds.). (2015). Climate change 2014: Synthesis report. *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.
- Roe, G. and M. Baker (2007). Why is climate sensitivity so unpredictable? *Science* 318, 629-632. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1144735>
- Scafetta, N. (2021). Testing the CMIP6 GCM simulations versus surface temperature records from 1980–1990 to 2011–2021: High ECS is not supported. *Climate*, 9(11), 161. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9110161>
- Schwartz, S. E., R. J. Charlson, H. Rodhe (2007). Quantifying climate change—Too rosy a picture? *Nature Climate Change* 1, 23–24, <https://doi.org/10.1038/climate.2007.22>
- Seager, R., Cane, M., Ting, M., Naik, N., Clement, A., DiNezio, P., & Lee, D. E. (2019). Strengthening tropical Pacific zonal sea surface temperature gradient consistent with rising greenhouse gases. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(7), 517–522. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0505-x>
- Sherwood, S. C., & Forest, C. E. (2024). Opinion: Can uncertainty in climate sensitivity be narrowed further? *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 24(5), 2679–2686. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-2679-2024>
- Sherwood, S. C., Bony, S., Boucher, O., Bretherton, C. S., Forster, P. M., Gregory, J. M., & Stevens, B. (2020). An assessment of Earth's climate sensitivity using multiple lines of evidence. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 58(4). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019rg000678>
- Soden, B. J., and I.M. Held (2006). An assessment of climate feedbacks in coupled ocean–atmosphere models. *Journal of Climate*, 19(14), 3354–3360. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli3799.1>
- Zelinka, M. D., Myers, T. A., McCoy, D. T., Po-Chedley, S., Caldwell, P. M., Ceppi, P., Klein, S. A., & Taylor, K. E. (2020). Causes of higher climate sensitivity in CMIP6 models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL085782. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085782>

5 MODELS VERSUS OBSERVATIONS IN THE RECENT PAST

Chapter summary

Climate models show warming biases in many aspects of their reproduction of the past few decades. In response to observed changes in forcing inputs they produce too much warming at the surface (except in the models with lowest ECS), too much warming in the lower-and mid-troposphere and too much amplification of warming aloft.

Climate models also produce too much recent stratospheric cooling, too much water vapor increase, too much snow loss, and too much warming in the corn belt. The IPCC has acknowledged some of these issues but not all.

5.1 Introduction

Climate models are the primary tool used to project future climate changes in response to increasing atmospheric levels of anthropogenic greenhouse gases. They provide theoretical evidence underpinning energy policy changes, such as efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. To assess the fitness of climate models for this purpose, it is reasonable to ask how well they reproduce the current climate and its variations over the past century. The nearby box “Climate modeling” gives some detail on how climate models work.

Of great concern is the fact that, after several decades of the climate modeling enterprise involving approximately three dozen models operated by research centers around the world, the range of future warming they produce in response to a hypothetical doubling of atmospheric CO₂ extends over a factor of three, as we discussed in the previous chapter. This range of disagreement among models has not changed for decades.

Problems with climate models are not just in their disagreement over the future, but also in their ability to replicate the recent past. Here we review some of the most important metrics of climate model accuracy: ability to reproduce historical surface, tropospheric and stratospheric temperature trends, ability to reproduce the vertical warming profile and ability to reproduce other climate features such as snowfall and humidity. In all cases a persistent finding is that models on average err on the side of too much warming in response to observed historical forcings.

Box: Climate modeling

Most climate models, except for the simplest ones, represent Earth's land surface using a grid of squares, typically 100 km wide. To simulate the atmosphere, 10 to 20 layers of grid boxes are stacked above these squares. The ocean is modeled using a similar but finer grid, resulting in approximately one million grid boxes for the atmosphere and 100 million for the ocean.

The computer models, based on physical laws, calculate how air, water, and energy move between grid boxes over time. The time step can be as small as 10 minutes, and repeating this process millions of times allows the simulation of climate over centuries. Running these models, even on the most powerful supercomputers, can take months. Comparing simulation results with historical climate data helps assess the accuracy of a model, while projections into the future estimate climate changes under assumed human and natural influences.

Despite sounding straightforward, climate modeling is highly complex. Many critical processes occur at scales smaller than the 100 km grid size. For instance, the flows of sunlight and heat in the atmosphere depend strongly on cloud cover. Since tracking individual clouds is impractical, researchers must make "subgrid" assumptions about the distribution of clouds in each grid box. Snow and ice cover, which affects how much sunlight is reflected or absorbed by the surface, is another subgrid factor.

Each subgrid assumption requires numerical parameters, which must be carefully set. Modelers initially estimate these parameters based on physics and observed climate patterns, then run the model. Because early results often diverge significantly from real-world observations, they "tune" these parameters to better match observed climate features. Different modeling teams use distinct assumptions and tuning strategies, leading to varied outcomes. Tuning is a necessary but delicate aspect of climate modeling, as it is in any complex system. Poor tuning can result in inaccurate simulations, while excessive tuning risks artificially steering results toward predetermined conclusions.

To distill useful insights from these varied models, climate studies often rely on averaged results from multiple models, forming an "ensemble." The latest UN IPCC assessments use the CMIP6 ensemble, which shows a significant diversity of results. One of the most basic climate indicators—the Earth's average surface temperature—varies by about 3°C across the ensemble, three times greater than observed warming during the 20th century.

Although model success in reproducing some features of today's climate is reassuring, the critical issue for society is how well they predict responses to subtle human influences, such as greenhouse gas emissions, aerosol cooling, and land-use changes. The most crucial aspect models must capture correctly is "feedbacks." These occur when climate changes triggered by greenhouse gases either amplify or suppress further warming. For example, as global temperatures rise, snow and ice melt, reducing Earth's reflectivity. With less reflective surfaces, the planet absorbs more sunlight, leading to additional warming. Other significant feedbacks involve water vapor levels, cloud formation, and atmospheric temperature profiles. Based on ensemble averages, the net effect of all feedbacks is estimated to double or triple the direct warming impact of CO₂.

5.2 Surface warming

A straightforward test of a climate model's validity is its ability to reproduce historical warming in response to known past changes in climate drivers such as greenhouse gases. Figure 5.2 is reproduced from Scaffeta (2023), a peer-reviewed study that groups the latest-generation (CMIP6) climate models into low ECS (1.5 to 3.0 degrees C), medium ECS (3.0 to 4.5 degrees C) and high ECS (4.5 to 6.0 degrees C), and compares their post-1980 global average temperature simulation ranges to those of three surface temperature records and one satellite-based lower troposphere temperature data product.

The leftmost column shows that the low-ECS models track the post-1980 historical warming record reasonably well, but the middle and right columns show that the medium- and high-ECS models conspicuously over-predict the warming.




Figure 5.2: model-observational comparisons for Earth's surface warming. The columns correspond to model groups showing low-ECS to high-ECS, while the rows correspond to widely-used observed temperature records, the first three showing surface averages and the fourth showing the lower troposphere average. In each panel the yellow area denotes the mean and range ($\pm$ one standard deviation) of climate model simulations for that group. The thick black line shows the observed annual average temperature in the indicated source. Source: Scafetta N. Climate Dynamics 2023 Fig.2.

Spencer (2024) has also provided a useful summary of the Model-Observation mismatch by comparing trends in surface temperature data products with those in individual climate models, as summarized in Figure 5.3.




Figure 5.3 Global surface air temperature trends (°C/decade), 1979-2024, from various CMIP6 climate models (red, 30-model average in orange); and the average of three thermometer datasets (HadCRUT5, NOAA Global Temp, and Berkeley 1 deg.) and two reanalysis datasets (ERA5 and NCEP/NCAR R1) in blue.. Source: Spencer (2024) updated

5.3 Tropospheric warming

It has long been known that climate models on average overstate warming in the tropical troposphere. This region is an important test of the models since it has long been hypothesized that this is where the signal of anthropogenic greenhouse warming emerges first and most strongly. Biases in tropospheric trends indicate model flaws in heat transfer processes and carry over to surface warming biases.

The discrepancy was flagged as a serious inconsistency in the first US Climate Change Science Program report (Karl et al. 2006) and has been mentioned in every IPCC report since, but the discrepancy has gotten worse over time, and the bias is now global. McKittrick and Christy (2020) compare tropospheric warming trends in CMIP6 climate models to observed trends from satellites, weather balloons and reanalysis systems. Figure 5.4 presents the comparisons with data updated to 2024. Every model overpredicts the average observed warming trend in both Lower- and Mid-Troposphere layers, both globally and in the tropics.




Figure 5.4: Observed versus CMIP6 modeled warming trends ($^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ 1979-2024) in the global and tropical lower (LT) and mid-troposphere (MT). Uses methodology of McKittrick and Christy (2020) on updated data. Blue dots: warming trends with 95% confidence interval bars for 3 data products (radiosondes, reanalysis and satellites) and 95% confidence interval bars. Blue dashed line: warming trend average for 3 observed series. Red dots: modeled warming trends in 35 models arranged lowest to highest.

In most individual models the bias is statistically significant and on average across models it is highly significant. McKittrick and Christy (2020) also show that the bias is larger in high-ECS models, but even the models with lower average ECS predict too much warming. If future climate models were to realistically represent global tropospheric warming, they would likely be less sensitive than even the low-ECS members of the CMIP6 ensemble.

As mentioned the IPCC has long acknowledged the model-observation mismatch. For example AR6 pp. 443-444 offers this on the tropical troposphere (it does not address the global comparison):

Several studies since AR5 have continued to demonstrate an inconsistency between simulated and observed temperature trends in the tropical troposphere, with models simulating more warming than observations (Mitchell et al., 2013, 2020; Santer et al., 2017a, b; McKittrick and Christy, 2018; Po-Chedley et al., 2021)... Over the 1979–2014 period, models are more consistent with observations in the lower troposphere, and least consistent in the upper troposphere around 200

hPa, where biases exceed 0.1°C per decade. Several studies using CMIP6 models suggest that differences in climate sensitivity may be an important factor contributing to the discrepancy between the simulated and observed tropospheric temperature trends (McKittrick and Christy, 2020; Po-Chedley et al., 2021), though it is difficult to deconvolve the influence of climate sensitivity, changes in aerosol forcing and internal variability in contributing to tropospheric warming biases (Po-Chedley et al., 2021). Another study found that the absence of a hypothesized negative tropical cloud feedback could explain half of the upper troposphere warming bias in one model (Mauritsen and Stevens, 2015).

... In summary, studies continue to find that CMIP5 and CMIP6 model simulations warm more than observations in the tropical mid- and upper-troposphere over the 1979–2014 period (Mitchell et al., 2013, 2020; Santer et al., 2017a, b; Suárez-Gutiérrez et al., 2017; McKittrick and Christy, 2018), and that overestimated surface warming is partially responsible (Mitchell et al., 2013; Po-Chedley et al., 2021). Hence, we assess with *medium confidence* that CMIP5 and CMIP6 models continue to overestimate observed warming in the upper tropical troposphere over the 1979–2014 period by at least 0.1°C per decade,

Notably, despite the accumulation of evidence of excess model warming the IPCC only assigns *medium confidence* to the existence of a warming bias.

5.4 Vertical temperature profile mismatch

Another important model-observational discrepancy is the excess amplification with altitude found in climate models. The comparison was in the IPCC AR5 Chapter 10, although only in the online supplement (Figure 10.SM.1) and only in a figure the formatting of which made the point difficult to see. Figure 10.SM.1 is not referenced in the main IPCC report nor in any summary so readers would not have been aware of it. Although not apparent at first glance, it shows that the 1979-2010 warming in the lower troposphere is so small as to be consistent with no GHG forcing at all, and is inconsistent with the model runs that do have GHG forcing. In Figure 5.6 we adapt IPCC AR5 Figure 10.SM.1 to draw out the critical point.




Figure 5.6: Vertical warming pattern for tropics (20S to 20N). Source: Annotated version of IPCC AR5 Figure 10.SM.1

Figure 5.6 compares temperature trends by altitude between models and observations between 20S and 20N (the tropics). In this region where the models say the warming should be strongest, the observations (shown here in white) lie within the “No CO₂” band and entirely outside the “with CO₂” red envelope. This means that in the entire tropical atmospheric column from the surface to the stratosphere, observed warming trends are so small they are consistent with the output of models that have no CO₂ warming effect in them, and they are inconsistent with the entire envelope of warming trends generated by models forced with increased CO₂.

A similar comparison is shown in Christy and McNider (2017), an updated version of which (covering 1979-2024) is reproduced as Figure 5.7. Modeled temperature trends exceed observations from the surface through the top of the troposphere, with observed trends below the entire model range at most pressure levels. Also shown in Figure 5.7 is the tropical tropospheric temperature (TTT) average from three satellite data products (NOAA, UAH and RSS) compared to the same layer average from climate models for 1979-2024. Again the observed trends lie below the entire model range.

The wide range of choices made by modelers to characterize the physical processes in the models (see Box: Climate Modeling in Section 5.1 above) is seen by the large spread of trends in the middle troposphere where values range over $\pm 40\%$ from the median value (Fig. 5.7). This illustrates the uncertainties characteristic of the varying attempts to model (parameterize) a complex system involving turbulence, moist thermodynamics and energy fluxes over the full range of time and space scales.




Figure 5.7: Modeled versus observed warming, tropical troposphere. Source: updated from Christy and McNider (2017) including data through 2024. Red line: model average. Green and blue lines: observational series (reanalysis).

This discrepancy has been the source of much controversy, with some arguing that even if there is very little observed warming aloft in the tropics, a “hotspot” still exists in the sense that the warming aloft is greater than at the surface. But there is good evidence that models also exaggerate the amplification rate. Klotzbach et al. (2009), showed that models project greater amplification with altitude than is observed. This result was subsequently confirmed by detailed time series analysis (Vogelsang and Nawaz 2016) who found that the model-observational difference is statistically significant.

This is a case in which models are not merely uncertain but share a common bias compared to observations. This suggests the representation of certain fundamental physical processes in climate model feedbacks have large discrepancies not only among models but against the real climate.

The IPCC AR6 did not assess this issue.

5.5 Stratospheric cooling

An important element of the expected general “fingerprint” of anthropogenic climate change is simultaneous warming of the troposphere and cooling of the stratosphere. The IPCC AR6 acknowledged that cooling had been observed but only up to the year 2000. Thereafter the stratosphere has exhibited some warming, contrary to model projections.

The AR6 WG1 Ch 2 pp. 327-9 states (emphasis added):

Temperatures averaged through the full lower stratosphere (roughly 10–25 km) have decreased over 1980–2019 in all data products, with **the bulk of the decrease prior to 2000**. The decrease

holds even if the influence of the El Chichon (1982) and Pinatubo (1991) volcanic eruptions on the trend, found by Steiner et al. (2020a) to have increased the 1979–2018 cooling trend by 0.06°C per decade, is removed. **Most datasets show no significant or only marginally significant trends over 2000–2019, and the results of Philipona et al. (2018) show weak increases over 2000–2015** in the very lowermost stratosphere sampled by radiosondes....

It is virtually certain that the lower stratosphere has cooled since the mid-20th century. However, most datasets show that **lower stratospheric temperatures have stabilized since the mid-1990s with no significant change over the last 20 years**. It is likely that middle and upper stratospheric temperatures have decreased since 1980, but there is low confidence in the magnitude.

The cited source, Philipona et al. (2018), in an article entitled “Radiosondes Show That After Decades of Cooling, the Lower Stratosphere Is Now Warming”, stated:

In response to continued greenhouse gas increases and stratospheric ozone depletion, climate models project continued tropospheric warming and stratospheric cooling over the coming decades. Global average satellite observations of lower stratospheric temperatures exhibit no significant trends since the turn of the century. In contrast, an analysis of vertically resolved radiosonde measurements from 60 stations shows an increase of lower stratospheric temperature since the turn of the century at altitudes between 15 and 30 km and over most continents. Trend estimates are somewhat sensitive to homogeneity assessment choices, but all investigated radiosonde data sets suggest a change from late twentieth century cooling to early 21st century warming in the lower stratosphere.

A combination of tropospheric warming and stratospheric cooling is a commonly-cited “fingerprint” of anthropogenic warming. Stratospheric warming since 2000 coincides with continued surface and tropospheric warming, a pattern that is not found in climate model simulations and is not apparently consistent with the anthropogenic fingerprint.

5.6 Snow cover mismatch

Data compiled by the Rutgers University Snow Lab (undated) show that Northern Hemisphere winter snow cover is not decreasing (Figure 5.8). If anything, it shows an increasing trend.




Figure 5.8: Northern Hemisphere Winter Snow extent.

Source: https://climate.rutgers.edu/snowcover/chart_seasonal.php?ui_set=nhland&ui_season=1
(February 24, 2024)

Yet models project declining Northern Hemisphere snow cover due to climate warming, as described by Connolly et al. (2019).

The climate models were found to poorly explain the observed trends [in Northern Hemisphere snow cover]. While the models suggest snow cover should have steadily decreased for all four seasons, only spring and summer exhibited a long-term decrease, and the pattern of the observed decreases for these seasons was quite different from the modelled predictions. Moreover, the observed trends for autumn and winter suggest a long-term increase, although these trends were not statistically significant.

AR6 largely confines its discussion of changing Northern Hemisphere snow cover extent (SCE) to the Spring season for which models and observations agree on a downward trend. Regarding Winter changes it remarks as follows (AR6 WGI Ch. 2 p. 344):

Assessment of SCE trends in the NH since 1978 indicates that for the October to February period there is substantial uncertainty in trends with the sign dependent on the observational product. Analysis using the NOAA Climate Data Record shows an increase in October to February SCE (Hernández-Henríquez et al., 2015; Kunkel et al., 2016) while analyses based on satellite borne

optical sensors (Hori et al., 2017) or multi-observation products (Mudryk et al., 2020) show a negative trend for all seasons.

AR6 WGI Chapter 9 (p. 1284) points out that the NOAA Climate Data Record showing increased fall and winter SCE is inconsistent with land-based observations and model-based data sets. It notes that using optical satellite imagery to infer SCE in winter is challenging due to cloud cover and decreased solar illumination in winter months.

Focusing on the Pacific Coast states (CA, OR and WA) cold season mountain snowfall that melts in spring and summer provides a substantial portion of warm season water resources. A comprehensive reconstruction of snowfall for the main source regions (Cascades and Sierra Nevada Mountains) indicates no significant trends in annual totals since the late 19th century (Christy 2022).

5.7 Hemispheric symmetry of the planetary albedo

The planetary albedo is the fraction of solar radiation reflected by the Earth back to space, and is an important component of the radiative balance and hence whether the planet will warm or cool over time. An intriguing property of the Earth's albedo is that, on average, the Northern Hemisphere (NH) and Southern Hemisphere (SH) have had very nearly the same albedo at least throughout the fifty-year satellite record (Stephens et al., 2015). This symmetry is surprising, because the SH has much more ocean than land. Since ocean is less reflective than land, the NH should have higher albedo. Clouds (which are highly reflective) are more common in the NH, and so compensate the surface albedo imbalances of the two hemispheres. Datseris and Stephens (2021) show that this cloud compensation comes from the extra-tropical storm tracks of the SH, which are cloudier than those of the NH. While the mechanism for this hemispheric symmetry is unclear, it likely operates on large temporal and spatial scales.

The hemispheric symmetry of the albedo is a simple gross metric for climate models. Rugenstein and Hakuba (2023) defined that metric as the difference between the NH and SH annual mean albedos, expressed as Wm^{-2} of the reflected sunlight, and compiled it for the CMIP6 climate models, as shown in Figure 5.9. Most of the CMIP6 models do not reproduce the small observed asymmetry (about 0.1 Wm^{-2}) and even disagree as to which hemisphere is more reflective. Moreover, the magnitude of the asymmetry ranges up to 5 Wm^{-2} in some models, twice as large as the current anthropogenic forcing (about 2.5 Wm^{-2}).

The significance of unphysical albedo asymmetries in the climate models is not yet fully known. However, other model studies suggest that interhemispheric changes in albedo can alter poleward heat fluxes, meridional temperature gradients, storminess, and differences in hemispheric ocean heat storage. The discrepancy between models and observations further raises issues regarding cloud feedback processes and so more generally diminishes confidence in model projections of the future climate.




Figure 5.9. Differences in 20-year average reflectivity (albedo) between the Northern and Southern Hemispheres for CMIP6 models used in the most recent IPCC assessment (colored bars). The very small observed difference is indicated by the vertical black line. From Rugenstein and Hakuba (2023).

5.8 US Corn Belt

One of the largest discrepancies between models and observations is in the U.S. Corn Belt, a region of particular importance to global food production. Figure 5.10 shows the warming trends for summertime (June, July, August) for the 12-state Corn Belt (IN, IA, NE, ND, SD, MO, MN, WI, MI, OH, KS, NE) during 1973-2022. All 36 climate models (red) warm far too rapidly compared to observations (blue).




Figure 5.10: Modeled versus observed warming trends in the US corn belt.

As discussed in Chapter 10, the anticipated negative effects of increasing temperatures on U.S. corn yields have not materialized, in contrast to widely publicized studies proclaiming that theoretical future impacts are already being experienced (e.g. Seager et al., 2018).

The IPCC acknowledges limitations in the accuracy of regional climate model outputs. This example shows that users need to assess model projections carefully on a case-by-case basis since local biases may be sufficiently large that the models are simply not fit for purpose. As has recently been noted by two leaders of the modeling community (emphasis added)

... for many key applications that require regional climate model output or for assessing large-scale changes from smallscale processes, we believe that **the current generation of models is not fit for purpose.** (Palmer and Stevens 2019)

To summarize:

- Climate models show warming biases in many aspects of their reproduction of the past few decades.
- They produce too much warming at the surface (except in the models with lowest ECS), too much warming in the lower-and mid-troposphere and too much amplification of warming aloft

- They also produce too much stratospheric cooling, too much snow loss, and too much warming in the corn belt.
- The hemispheric albedo difference in individual climate models ranges widely in sign and magnitude compared to observations. The range in Watts/m² is three times larger than the direct anthropogenic forcing of CO₂.
- The IPCC has acknowledged some of these issues but not others.

References

- Christy, J. R., R. T. McNider (2017). Satellite bulk tropospheric temperatures as a metric for climate sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences* 53, 511-518.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z>
- Christy, J. R. (2022). Time series construction of Oregon and Washington snowfall since 1890 and an update of California snowfall through 2020. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 23, 1845-1860.
<https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-21-0178.1>
- Connolly, R., M. Connolly, W. Soon, et al. (2019). Northern Hemisphere snow-cover trends (1967–2018): A comparison between climate models and observations. *Geosciences* 9, 135.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences9030135>
- Datseris, G., B. Stevens (2021). Earth’s albedo and its symmetry. *AGU Advances* 2, e2021AV000440. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021AV000440>
- Karl, T.R., S. J. Hassol, C. D. Miller, W. L. Murray, eds. (2006). Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences. U.S. Climate Change Science Program/Subcommittee on Global Change Research.
https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc12017/m2/1/high_res_d/sap1-1-final-all.pdf
- Klotzbach, P.J., R. A. Pielke, Sr., R. A. Pielke, Jr., J. R. Christy, R. T. McNider (2009). An alternative explanation for differential temperature trends at the surface and in the lower troposphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research — Atmospheres* 114(D21).
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JD011841>
- McKittrick, R., J. R. Christy (2020). Pervasive warming bias in CMIP6 tropospheric layers. *Earth and Space Science* 7. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020EA001281>
- Palmer, T., and B. Stevens (2019). The scientific challenge of understanding and estimating climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(49), 24390–24395.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906691116>
- Philipona, R., C. Mears, M. Fujiwara, et al. (2018). Radiosondes show that after decades of cooling, the lower stratosphere is now warming. *Journal of Geophysical Research—Atmospheres* 123.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD028901>
- Rugenstein, M., and M. Hakuba (2023). Connecting hemispheric asymmetries of planetary albedo and surface temperature. *Geophysical Research Letters* 50, e2022GL101802.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL101802>
- Scafetta, N. (2022). Advanced testing of low, medium, and high ECS CMIP6 GCM simulations versus ERA5-T2m. *Geophysical Research Letters* 49(6), e2022GL097716.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL097716>
- Seager, R., J. Feldman, N. Lis, et al. (2017). Whither the 100th meridian? The once and future physical and human geography of America’s arid–humid divide. Part II: The meridian moves east. *Earth Interactions* 22. <https://doi.org/10.1175/EI-D-17-0012.1>

- Spencer, R. W. (2024). Global warming: Observations vs. climate models. Environment Backgrounder, The Heritage Foundation.
<https://www.heritage.org/environment/report/global-warming-observations-vs-climate-models>
- Stephens, G. L., D. O'Brien, P.J. Webster et al. (2015). The albedo of Earth. *Reviews of Geophysics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/2014RG000449>
- Vogelsang, T. and N. Nawaz (2016). Estimation and inference of linear trend slope ratios with an application to global temperature data: *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 38.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsa.12209>

6 EXTREME WEATHER

Chapter Summary

Most types of extreme weather exhibit no statistically significant long-term trends over the available historical record. While there has been an increase in hot days in the US since the 1950s, a point emphasized by the IPCC AR6, numbers are still low relative to the 1920s and 1930s. Extreme convective storms, hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and droughts exhibit considerable natural variability but long-term increases are not detected. Some increases in extreme precipitation events can be detected in some regions over short intervals but over long periods and at the regional scale the trends do not persist. Wildfires are not more common in the US than they were in the 1980s. Burned area increased from the 1960s to the early 2000's, however it is low compared to the estimated natural baseline level. US wildfire activity is strongly affected by forest management practices.

6.1 Introduction

High impact weather extremes, usually related to temperature, precipitation and/or high wind, can disrupt infrastructure and therefore endanger human health and wellbeing. The issue is not whether extremes occur. Rather, it is whether there are long-term (decadal scale) changes in the frequency or character of extremes (“detection”), as well as the extent to which such changes and the attendant changes in hazards are caused by anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (“attribution”; e.g., IPCC AR6 Seneviratne et al. 2021).

It is naïve to assume that any recent extreme event is caused by human influences on the climate. Climate is about the statistical properties of weather over decades, not single events. Further, there are only about 130 years of reliable observational records that can be analyzed statistically. That brief interval does not begin to contain all the extreme events that the climate system can create on its own. Over geologic time the climate system has generated an (essentially) infinite variety of weather patterns and extremes that humans have never observed and thus are absent from the databases used to determine extreme statistics [see *Perils of short data records* below]. For that reason, attributing an extreme event unprecedented in the record requires assumptions about the magnitude of natural variations.

This chapter is concerned with detection of trends in extreme weather, while Chapter 8 considers causal attribution, with Section 8.4 specifically addressing extreme weather. If no trend is detected, then clearly there is no basis for attribution. But even where a trend is observed, attribution to human-caused warming should not be assumed to follow.

This is especially true for precipitation events. The hydrological literature has long noted the phenomenon of *Long-Term Persistence* (LTP) in rainfall data (Hurst 1951, Cohn and Lins 2005, Markonis and Koutsoyiannis 2016). LTP has a formal mathematical definition, but it can be thought of as the presence of natural variations with strong autocorrelations that result in cycle-like behavior on long time scales. The presence of LTP requires long records to accurately estimate variability. Analysis of records that are short relative to the LTP scale will tend to underestimate variability, therefore overstating the significance of apparent trends and underestimating the likelihood of extreme events (Cohn and Lins 2005).




Figure 6.1.1: The annual minimum depth of the Nile River near Cairo over more than 650 years from 622 to 1284 A.D. The data, measured in meters, shows a characteristic pattern of year-to-year fluctuations around longer-term trends. Data from Koutsoyiannis (2013)

A good example of LTP is the eight-century long record of the annual minimum height of the Nile River observed at Roda Island in Cairo shown in Figure 6.1.1. Since human influences on the global climate were negligible before the 20th century, the century-scale variability of the thirty-year average is entirely natural; Egyptians of the seventh and eighth centuries would have been incorrect to assume that the worsening drought during that time was the “new normal.”

With these caveats in mind, we examine the evidence for changes in selected weather and climate extremes. An emergent theme is the wide gap between public perceptions and scientific evidence. It has become routine in media coverage, government and private sector discussions, and even in some academic literature to make generalized assertions that extreme weather of all types is getting worse due to GHGs and “climate change.” Yet expert assessments typically have not drawn such sweeping conclusions and instead have emphasized the difficulty both of identifying specific trends and establishing a causal connection with anthropogenic forcing.

In the sections to follow we provide excerpts from various IPCC and NCA assessment reports denoting the sources as follows:

SREX: The IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (2012)

AR6: The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report Working Group 1 (2021).

NCA4: The US Climate Science Special Report of the Fourth National Climate Assessment (2017) Volume I.

NCA5: The US Climate Science Special Report of the Fifth National Climate Assessment (2023) Volume I.

Note that in the excerpts, *italics* are in the original whereas **boldface** emphasis has been added.

Additionally we present updated data series from standard government sources to provide up-to-date information through 2024 wherever possible.

6.2 Hurricanes and tropical cyclones

The AR6 provides the following assessment of tropical cyclones (TCs; used here as a synonym for hurricanes):

AR6: There is *low confidence* in most reported long-term (multidecadal to centennial) trends in TC frequency or intensity-based metrics due to changes in the technology used to collect the best-track data. (IPCC, 2021)

AR6: It is *likely* that the global proportion of major (Category 3–5) tropical cyclone occurrence has increased over the last four decades . . . There is *low confidence* in long-term (multi-decadal to centennial) trends in the frequency of all-category tropical cyclones. (IPCC, 2023)

AR6: A subset of the best-track data corresponding to hurricanes that have directly impacted the United States since 1900 is considered to be reliable, and shows **no trend in the frequency of U.S. landfall events**.

Since 1980, when satellite observations fully covered the global oceans, we have confidence in the numbers of total global hurricanes and major hurricanes (Category 3 and higher). Figure 6.2.1 shows that on average, each year there are about 50 hurricanes, with about 25 reaching major hurricane status (Maue, 2025). There is substantial year-to-year and decadal variability a weak decreasing trend in the number of hurricanes and a slight but insignificant increasing trend in the number of major hurricanes These two trends combine to create an increasing trend in proportion of major hurricanes.

Global hurricane statistics are dominated by the Northwest Pacific Ocean, which accounts for ~35 percent of total global hurricanes, whereas the Atlantic accounts for ~15 percent of global hurricanes (Colorado State University, 2025). Data in the Atlantic basin extends further back than in the other ocean basins, and is most relevant to U.S. policy makers.

Global Major Hurricane Frequency -- 12 month running sums -- @RyanMaue

Updated March 10, 2025

Last 30-years, annual: 45 H | 24 M




Figure 6.2.1: Global frequency of hurricanes and major hurricanes since 1980.

Figure 6.2.2 shows the frequency of Atlantic hurricanes and major hurricanes (Category 3 and higher) back to 1920. Data prior to 1965 (the onset of satellite observations in the Atlantic, shaded in blue) shows some undercounting, with data prior to 1920 showing substantial undercounting (Vecchi and Knutson, 2011). All measures of Atlantic hurricane activity show a significant increase since 1970. However, the period from 1971-1994 was a period of exceptionally low activity, with high values of hurricane activity (comparable to the past two decades, even with undercounting) also observed during the 1950's and 1960's, and even in the 1930's.




Figure 6.2.2: Atlantic frequency of hurricanes (HR) and major hurricanes (MHR) since 1920. Source National Hurricane Center (2024)

Figure 6.2.2 shows that Atlantic hurricanes vary strongly on decadal and multidecadal time scales. These variations are associated primarily with the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), which is manifest in basin-wide sea surface temperature and sea level pressure fluctuations connected to large scale ocean circulation patterns. The AMO was in its warm phase during 1926-1970 and 1995-present, but in its cool phase during 1971-1994. The AMO has its greatest impact on the number of major hurricanes (Category 3+) identified by Goldenberg et al. (2001) to be associated with above normal SSTs and decreased vertical shear in the AMO warm phase (see also Bell and Chelliah, 2006; Klotzbach et al., 2018).

Klotzbach et al. (2018) conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the landfalling hurricane data for the Continental U.S. since 1900. Figure 6.3.3 updates their analysis through 2024. While the largest numbers of hurricanes are from 2004, 2005 and 2020, there is no statistically significant trend since 1920. Figure 6.2.3 also shows the time series for major hurricane landfalls (Category 3-5). The largest year in the record is 2005, with 4 major hurricane landfalls. However, there were no major hurricanes striking the U.S from 2006 through 2016, the longest such period since 1920.




Figure 6.2.3: US landfalling frequency of hurricanes (HR) and major hurricanes (MHR) since 1920. Source NOAA HRD(a) (2024)

Substantial interannual to multidecadal variability in U.S. landfall activity is seen Figure 6.2.3. Klotzbach et al. (2018) examined how the landfall counts vary with ENSO (El Niño versus La Niña) and the warm versus cold phases of the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO).

Villarini et al. (2012) provide an analysis of U.S. hurricane landfalls back to 1878. While it is possible that some landfalls were missed in the late 19th century owing to sparsely populated regions on the Gulf Coast, it is remarkable that the highest year in the entire record, is 1886, with 7 landfalls,

Table 6.2.1 shows the 10 strongest hurricanes (plus ties) to make U.S. landfall. Of the hurricanes that have made landfall with sustained winds greater than 150 mph, only one has occurred in the 21st century.

In summary, analyses of both global and regional variability and trends of hurricane activity provide the basis for detecting changes and understanding their causes. The relatively short historical record of hurricane activity, and the even shorter record from the satellite era, is not sufficient to assess whether recent hurricane activity is unusual relative to the background natural variability. Atlantic hurricane processes are influenced substantially by the natural modes of ocean circulation variability in the Atlantic, notably the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation. While it has long been hypothesized that a rising global sea surface temperature would cause an increase in hurricane intensity, identification of any significant trend in the hurricane data is hampered by a short data record and substantial natural variability.

Rank	Year	Landfall Wind (MPH)	Name
1	1935	185	"Labor Day"
2	1969	175	Camille
3	1992	165	Andrew
4	2018	160	Michael
5	1856	150	"Last Island"
5	1886	150	"Indianola"
5	1919	150	-----
5	1932	150	"Freeport"
5	2004	150	Charley
5	2020	150	Laura
5	2021	150	Ida
5	2022	150	Ian

Table 6.2.1 Strongest hurricanes to make landfall along the US coast. Source (NOAA HRD(b), 2024)

6.3 Temperature extremes

The AR6 assessment focused on the period after 1950 and reported increasing trends in heatwave frequency and intensity. However, the NCA4 noted that heatwave activity in the US reached a peak in the 1930s.

AR6: It is *virtually certain* that hot extremes (including heatwaves) have become **more frequent** and **more intense** across most land regions since the 1950s, while cold extremes (including cold waves) have become less frequent and less severe (SPM, A3.1)

AR6: In North America, there is very robust evidence for a *very likely* increase in the intensity and frequency of hot extremes and decrease in the intensity and frequency of cold extremes for the whole continent, though there are substantial spatial and seasonal variations in the trends. Minimum temperatures display warming consistently across the continent, while there are more contrasting trends in the annual maximum daily temperatures in parts of the USA. (Chapter 11, p 1550)

NCA4: Changes in warm extremes are more nuanced than changes in cold extremes. For instance, the warmest daily temperature of the year **increased** in some parts of the West over the past century, but there were **decreases** in almost all locations east of the Rocky Mountains. In fact, all eastern regions experienced a net **decrease**, most notably the Midwest (about 2.2°F [1.2°C]) and the Southeast (roughly 1.5°F [0.8°C]). (pp. 190-191)

NCA4: Since the mid-1960s, there has been only a very slight increase in the warmest daily temperature of the year (amidst large interannual variability). Heat waves (6-day periods with a maximum temperature above the 90th percentile for 1961–1990) increased in frequency until the mid-1930s, became considerably less common through the mid-1960s, and increased in frequency again thereafter. As with warm daily temperatures, **heat wave magnitude reached a maximum in the 1930s.** (pp. 190-191)




Figure 6.3.1: US Heat waves since 1900. Source: NCA4 Figure 6.4

6.3.1 *Temperatures in the US are becoming less extreme*

Daily maximum temperatures in the warm season (Tmax, May-Sep) and daily minimum temperatures in the cold season (Tmin, Dec-Mar) are available beginning in Dec 1898 (126 years). The dataset consists of 1,211 CONUS stations designated as United States Historical Climate Network or USHCN stations (see Figure 6.3.2; Quinlan et al. 1987, Karl et al. 1990). These stations were selected by NOAA as having the fewest problematic issues with gaps, station moves and instrument changes. Where gaps still exist, nearby stations (bias-corrected) were merged so that the median volume of data available for a station is 98%. Although there are certainly errors in the dataset, with over 1,000 stations we can have relatively high confidence in any underlying signal that might be discovered.




Figure 6.3.2 Locations of USHCN temperature stations. Source: USHCN.

We begin with the question of whether the occurrence of daily record high or low temperatures has changed since Dec 1898. Each warm-season has 153 days (1 May to 30 Sep) and each cold-season has 122 days (1 Dec to 31 Mar). For each station and day, we calculated the year in which the record highest (lowest) temperature occurred. With 126 years of observations, if there were no temperature trends over time, the expected number of records for Tmax would be 1.21 ($=153/126$) per station per year and for Tmin 0.96 ($=122/126$) per station per year.

Figure 6.3.3 shows the observed distribution in time of the occurrence of these extreme events. There is a common feature in many metrics of warm-season extremes in the CONUS - the exceptional heat of the 1920s and especially the 1930s, peaking in 1936. On a per-station average, 60% of the Tmax records and 59% of the Tmin records occurred in the first half of the period (1899-1961).




Figure 6.3.3 Number of daily record High (red) and Low (blue) temperatures for warm and cold seasons in the CONUS. The lines represent the 15-year running, centered average. Source: 1,211 USHCN stations supplemented as needed to achieve a minimum of 92% of observations in the 126-year period since Dec 1898. US48: contiguous US states. Tmax: maximum temperature. Tmin: minimum temperature.

On the cold side, the Valentine's Day Arctic outbreak in Feb 1899 stands as the most extensive cold extreme experienced by the CONUS, with 1917 in 2nd place. The frequency of cold records has declined, especially over the last quarter of the period in which only 13% of the extreme cold events were measured. In contrast, 25% of the extreme Tmax records were achieved in the last quarter, in accordance with statistical expectations. These general features have been noted in past assessments (see above, IPCC AR6, NCA4). Combining the two records the overall reduction in numbers of both cold and hot extremes over the past century indicates a climate less prone to extremes.

This pattern is also shown in Figure 6.3.4. For each station and for each year the hottest warm season and coldest cold-season temperatures were calculated. Then the differences between these were computed by station and geographically-averaged over all stations, thus yielding an annual measure of the expected range of local extreme temperatures for each year. Figure 6.3.4 shows the 15-year trailing average of this measure, which has clearly declined over the past century.




Figure 6.4.4. 15-year trailing average of the difference each year of each station's hottest warm-season Tmax and coldest cold-season Tmin relative to the long-term average. Source: USHCN, author calculations.

The average difference for each station between the hottest summer Tmax and coldest winter Tmin has declined by about 5°F in the past 126 years. The decline is due mostly to warmer winter Tmin, but a decline in summer Tmax is also a factor. The rise in Tmin has been strongly related to the growing presence of manufactured surfaces around the weather stations over the last 100+ years (the so-called urban heat island effect; Spencer et al. 2025).

In summary, while temperature extremes are regularly experienced in the U.S. and attract a great deal of media attention, long term records show the US climate has become less extreme over time (milder) when measured by the range between warm season maxima and cold season minima.

6.3.2 Exceedances of a heat threshold

Under the heading of “The Risk of Temperature Extremes is Changing”, the most recent US National Climate Assessment report (NCA5) notes the increase in a threshold metric of number of days at or above 95°F, stating,

The western US has been particularly affected by extreme heat since the 1980s ..., experiencing a larger increase in days over 95°F, as would be expected given the greater warming in that region relative to the eastern US. Several major heatwaves have affected the US since 2018, including a record-shattering event in the Pacific Northwest in 2021.

Are the occurrences of 95°F days changing? In a climate as varied as that of CONUS, threshold statistics can be misleading. A region with many stations that have near 95°F Tmax average temperatures in the summer might see large swings in the metric when only small changes in average temperature occur. Elsewhere with stations that either rarely or virtually always achieve 95°F Tmax temperatures, a small change will not have much impact on the results.




Figure 6.3.5. Total number of days $\geq 95^{\circ}\text{F}$ in 6-yr periods, US 48 (bars) and regions (lines). Interval is 6-years as this is divisible into 126. Source: USHCN, author calculations. US48: contiguous US states. See Figure 6.3.2 for region names.

In the past 126 years, the average CONUS station experienced 129 days exceeding 95°C per 6-yr period, but the regional values range from 278 in the Southern Plains to 9 in the Northeast. Thus, such threshold analyses must be interpreted with caution. Figure 6.3.5 shows that only three of the nine regions, all in the West, have experienced upward trends in the number of 95°F or hotter days (dashed lines). The CONUS as a whole has not, and the other six regions have experienced declines.

The Pacific NW heatwave of 2021 referenced in the NCA5 quote will be examined more closely in Section 8.5. The evidence indicates that it was a single, unprecedented event in the record, not part of a pattern of increasing extreme heat. For example, the 5-day average tropospheric grid-point temperature anomaly over the Pacific NW during that event was $+10.8^{\circ}\text{C}$, the most extreme Northern Hemisphere grid point summer anomaly in the 46 years from over 4 million grid values. In contrast, the global temperature anomaly during that time was virtually zero ($+0.03^{\circ}\text{C}$, Mass et al. 2024).

The NCA5 heading “The Risk of Temperature Extremes is Changing” suggests pervasive positive trends are now being observed in threshold temperatures, but that is not evident in the figures above.

6.3.3 Heatwaves

Heatwaves (consecutive days that exceed an extreme threshold) have a greater societal impact than a single daily record temperature. We measure “Heatwave Days” here as the count of all days in May-Sep each year that exceed the 90th percentile for that day and that lie within a period of at least six consecutive days. This is equivalent to the method used in NCA4, except that the reference period here is the entire record 1899-2024 while NCA4 truncated the reference period to 1961-1990, which was a cool period. That truncation boosts positive results (days exceeding the 90th percentile) in periods warmer than the reference period, especially starting in 1960 and moving to the present (see *Urban Influences* below).




Figure 6.3.6 15-year trailing average of number of heatwave days per year per station in the CONUS (black line) and four regions: West (red), Central-east (green).

Figure 6.3.6 indicates that there are regional variations in heatwave activity. The excessive heat of the first half of the 20th century occurred primarily in the eastern two-thirds of the nation, while the West has seen a recent increase of heatwave days (NCA5). This indicates that the background warm season circulation favored heatwaves in the eastern portions of the country in the first half of the 20th century, but in the 21st century the patterns have favored heatwaves in the West. For CONUS as a whole, heatwaves are no more common today than they were a century ago, consistent with the upper panel of our Figure 6.4.1 taken from NCA4.

This metric varies significantly with region. The four northern regions (Pacific NW, Northern Plains, Upper Midwest, and Northeast) on average experience 15 to 27 heatwave days per 15-year period. In contrast, the five southern regions (Pacific Southwest, 4-Corners, Southern Plains, Ohio Valley and Southeast) see 37 to 54 such days, essentially twice as many. This suggests the summer circulation pattern is more prone to stationary events in the southern regions while transient systems in the northern regions are more common and thus cut short these potentially longer events.

The analysis of heatwaves is an example of why it is important to consider complete datasets and appropriate metrics. The NCA5 directs readers to the website <https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves> (USGCRP 2023) to view a figure showing the number of urban heatwaves by decade from the 1960s, which we reproduce as Figure 6.3.7.




Figure 6.3.7: Average number of urban heatwaves per year for 50 large U.S. metropolitan areas. From <https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves>

The figure shows a monotonic increase in each decade from 2 occurrences per year in the 1960s to 6 in the 2020s. The definition of a heatwave used is an unusual but practical measure of human discomfort - a period of at least 2 consecutive days when the *minimum* apparent temperature (combination of temperature and humidity) exceeds the 85th percentile. Note too, the dataset is limited to the 50 largest U.S. cities.

Given the unusual heatwave definition and urban focus, these increasing values since 1960 presented in USGCRP (2023) are not informative about long term trends or the influence of GHG emissions for at least two reasons. First, as shown in Figures 6.3.1 and 6.3.6, the 1960s was the coldest decade and 1970s the second coldest decade since the 1910's, so this starting date preconditions the time series to show increases. Second, post-1960 urbanization in these cities is a major factor in the rise of Tmin relative to co-located Tmax and relative to Tmin at nearby rural stations. This does not dismiss the real rise in nighttime temperatures in major U. S. cities and the societal impacts associated with these changes. However, we note for a variety of reasons, that summer Tmax (especially in rural areas) is a better metric for detecting changes in heatwaves influenced by changes in the background climate due, for example, to increasing GHGs (Christy et al. 2009). For the CONUS as a whole, the evidence in this section suggests GHG emissions have had little-to-no effect on heatwaves.

6.4 Extreme precipitation

The IPCC AR6 assessed that an increase in heavy precipitation has been observed in data starting in the 1950s.

AR6: The frequency and intensity of **heavy precipitation events have increased** since the 1950s over most land area for which observational data are sufficient for trend analysis (high confidence). (SPM A3.2)

AR6: In North America, there is robust evidence that the **magnitude and intensity of extreme precipitation has *very likely* increased** since the 1950s. Both [one-day maxima] and [5-day maxima] have significantly increased in North America during 1950-2018. (Chapter 11, p. 1560)

The US National Climate Assessments (NCA4, NCA5) have highlighted an increase in the occurrence of the heaviest precipitation events (defined in different ways) primarily in the eastern half of the CONUS, especially the Northeast, when starting the analysis in either 1901 or 1958. Interestingly, the regional variations indicate that the largest increases in extreme precipitation events are in the Northeast and the smallest in the West, a pattern counter to the changes in temperature extremes.

McKittrick and Christy (2019) examined long-term and consistent station observations of extreme daily precipitation to test some of these NCA claims for the Southeast and West Coast using a trend model with a non-parametric variance estimator robust to the complex autocorrelation properties of precipitation data. When the time series were extended back in time (as far as 1872 in some cases) or when starting later (1978), there were no significant trends for either region.

These findings have been updated for this report (McKittrick and Christy 2025) with similarly constructed observations from 29 stations on the CONUS Pacific Coast (1893ff from San Diego CA to Blaine WA) and 24 stations in the humid Southeast (1872ff from Austin TX to Washington DC), also adding 27 stations in the Northeast (1888ff from Buffalo NY to Eastport ME). The locations are shown in Figure 6.4.1. The stations were selected on the basis of availability of long-term high-quality records. The regions are each associated with important features of extreme precipitation behavior. The Pacific coast is associated with landfalling atmospheric rivers. The NCA report has indicated that the Northeast has experienced the greatest increase in extreme events. The Southeast is also a place noted in the NCAs for increased extreme events.

The results of applying the analysis of McKittrick and Christy (2019) were as follows for each region, then followed by further explanation.

Pacific Coast heavy rainfall events

- Average precipitation trend is statistically significant (downwards) in Astoria OR; insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Big Sur CA; insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Aberdeen WA and Big Sur CA and negative and significant in Newport OR (insignificant elsewhere).
- Averaged over all stations in the region, none of these three trend parameters is statistically significant.

The Pacific Coast receives considerable precipitation from Atmospheric River (AR) events which often last more than a day or two (e.g., Gershunov et al. 2017, Pan et al. 2024). The worst series of such events in recent history was the so-called ARkStorm that occurred between December 1861 and January 1862; it dumped nearly 10 feet of rain in parts of California and submerged the entire Central Valley for weeks under as much as 15 feet of water (Brewer 1930, Null and Hulbert 2007). Additionally, Paleoclimate research has found six megastorms more severe than 1861–1862 in California during the last 1800 years, occurring at intervals of 300 years or so (Porter et al. 2011).




Figure 6.4.1: Locations of precipitation monitoring stations used in this report. Orange: Pacific coast. Blue: Northeast. Green: Southeast.

We examine occurrences of 5-day deluges as follows. Taking the Pacific coast as an example, a 130-year span contains 26 5-year intervals. At each location we computed the 5-day precipitation totals throughout the year and selected the 26 highest values across the sample. A single year may have more than one of the 26 heaviest. Each of those can be thought of as 1-in-5yr events. If there are no trends in precipitation, then the total number of these events across all stations should be evenly spread out over the years. In Fig. 6.4.2 we show the distribution in time of these events for the Pacific coast. The deluges associated with the massive 1997-98 El Niño event are readily apparent. While erratic, as is typical of such precipitation metrics, there is no indication of a tendency to become more frequent over time.

Southeast heavy rainfall events

- The trend in average precipitation is positive and statistically significant in Mobile AL and Quitman GA, and insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Mobile AL, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Vicksburg MS and Norfolk VA, and insignificant elsewhere.
- Averaged over all stations in the region none of these three trend parameters is statistically significant

Figure 6.4.3 shows the same calculation for the last 150 years in the Southeast humid zone. The temporal pattern of 5-day totals of the 1-in-5yr heavy events is generally unremarkable, though a cluster of higher values appears in 1995 to 2019. The increase in those years is due largely to the 4 northeastern-most stations of Wilmington NC, Weldon NC, Washington DC, and Norfolk VA. This confirms the pattern indicated in NCA4 and NCA5 -- an increasing frequency of heavy events due to a temporal clustering of tropical storms from eastern NC to Maine discussed below. Otherwise, the remaining 20 stations show an unremarkable temporal distribution of heavy events.

BOX: Perils of short data records

San Francisco provides a good case study of the limitation of using short historical samples to characterize natural variability of extreme events. Suppose we use a 130-year sample of daily San Francisco precipitation from 1895 to 2024 and we look for 3-day, 5-day, 14-day and 30-day rainfall records. The results are as shown in Table 7.2.

Event	Record (inches)	Year
3-day	6.94	2023
5-day	8.55	2023
14-day	12.62	2023
30-day	18.93	1998

Table 6.2: Extreme rainfall records, San Francisco, 1895-2024.

The records all cluster in the more recent years. 2023 appears to be an exceptional year and since it is near the end of the sample, it might suggest that the climate has shifted into a more hazardous state, perhaps as a result of human influences. [Note: “2023” indicates the event occurred in the water-year of Aug 2022 to Jul 2023.]

But the picture is very different if we use a sample that begins 45 years earlier, in 1850. Table 6.3 shows that the record-setting events all happened in the 1860s. Furthermore 2023 is now not even in 2nd place but falls to 3rd or 4th place. Also, comparing the records of the two charts the extreme precipitation events in 1862 and 1867 involved considerably more rainfall than the 1998 and 2023 events, with 14- and 30-day totals about 50 percent higher.

Event	Record (inches)	Year	Rank of 130-yr extreme
3-day	8.85	1867	3
5-day	9.80	1867	3
14-day	19.05	1862	4
30-day	28.25	1862	2

Table 6.3: Extreme rainfall records, San Francisco, 1850-2024.

The range of natural variability is made even more remarkable when paleoclimate evidence is examined. Porter et al. (2011) discovered that in the past 1,800 years at least six megastorms were more intense than the devastating 1861-62 ArkStorm that struck the region. Evidently such extreme events, “unprecedented” in our 1895-2024 sample, have impacted the region about every 300 years, though not since 1895.

This example illustrates the limitations of using relatively short climate periods (~130 years) to assess the character and range of natural variability in general and of extreme events in particular. Accurate representation of the full range of natural variability is necessary for any attribution analyses (see 6.4). Infrastructure planners, emergency management institutions and attribution scientists would understand the significant mischaracterization of the magnitude of a future extreme if based only on the last 130 years. In this case, a single time-sample of 130 years provides an underestimation of the extreme value by up to 50% determined when adding only 45 more years of observations. Compared to millennial-scale paleoclimate evidence, an even greater underestimation would occur. An important lesson is that the climate can deliver great surprises on its own, even without human influences.




Figure 6.4.2. The time distribution by 5-year periods of the 26 heaviest (1-in-5 yr) occurrences for 29 stations on the Pacific coast.




Figure 6.4.3. As in Fig. 6.4.2 but for the heaviest 30 (1-in-5yr) events for 24 stations in the humid Southeast from Austin TX to Washington DC in 5-year bins for 1875-2024.




Figure 6.4.4. As in Fig. 6.4.2 but for the heaviest 27 (1-in-5yr) 3-day precipitation events for 27 Northeast stations from NY to ME, including Montreal.

Northeast heavy rainfall events

- The trend in average precipitation is positive and statistically significant in 12 of 27 locations and also in the regional average.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Portland ME, Albany NY, Buffalo NY and Eastport ME, but insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Portland ME, Gardiner ME and Eastport ME, but insignificant elsewhere.
- When averaged over all stations in the region, there is no statistically significant trend in either the precipitation variance or maximum

Fig. 6.4.4 shows the same calculation for the last 135 years in 21 stations in the Northeast (including Montreal Canada). We use 3-day totals here as this produced the largest temporal variations in time. In this region, 72% of events occur during June to October and are dominated by incursions of hurricanes, tropical storms, or tropical storms that transition to extratropical systems. According to NCA4 and NCA5 this region experienced the largest increases in extreme events, so it merits a closer examination.

There is a noticeable clustering of extreme events from 1995 to 2014. Howarth et al. (2019) examined a similar region as in Fig. 6.4.4 that includes PA and NJ and reported significant differences between two 18-year periods, 1979-96 and 1997-2014, of various precipitation extremes, including a 317% increase in 24-hr events exceeding 6 inches, while we find a 51% increase over the same years. However, Figure 6.4.4 shows that frequency drops sharply after 2014, returning to the long-term average in the subsequent 5 year intervals, again illustrating the perils of drawing conclusions from short-term trends in highly variable metrics.




Figure 6.4.5. Average amount of precipitation falling in the 1-in-5yr events for the NE stations.

Also the high percentage increase in the Howarth et al. sample is associated with small numbers at relatively few locations: there were only 6 in the first period and 25 in the second across 58 stations. Most of the stations did not record such an event. If there is a region-wide increase in heavy events, it should be seen in the average across all stations. Figure 6.4.5 shows the average precipitation in the 1-in-5 yr events across the NE. The trend is only $+0.02''/\text{decade}$. The highest amount, 1935-39, includes the Great New England Hurricane of 1938, one of the rare major (Category 3 or higher) hurricanes to strike the region. The results in Figs. 6.4.4 and 6.4.5 thus suggest that though there was a surge in the number of events at a few locations during the 1995 to 2014 interval, there was no regional pattern and the change did not persist beyond 2014.

Jong et al. (2024) document the increase of tropical influences on precipitation events in the Northeast since 1959 and concluded, “The autumn extreme precipitation trend over the Northeast US is primarily attributed to tropical cyclone-related events since the 1990s.” The question then becomes: was the temporal clustering of tropical systems in 1997-2014 which affected the Northeast a response to increasing GHGs? Jong et al. examined CMIP-6 model output which suggests that there will be fewer such systems in the 21st century but that the intensity of the rainfall events might increase. This conjecture is not seen in Fig. 6.4.5 where the amount-per-event has remained steady over the 135-year period.

There is some evidence to indicate the heaviest rainfall events may be redistributed due to the impact urban infrastructure has on the local weather (e.g., Pielke Sr. et al. 2011, Zhang et al. 2018, Yang et al. 2024). Yang et al. state, “Cities that experience compact development tend to witness larger increases in extreme rainfall frequency over downtown than their rural surroundings, while the anomalies in extreme rainfall frequency diminish for cities with dispersed development.” While this is an important insight to consider, the effect on the specific stations used in this analysis is unknown, or at least not detectable in Fig. 6.4.4.

In summary, some regions show short-interval increases in extreme precipitation events, consistent with natural variability. But analysis of long term, nationwide historical records taking into account the autocorrelation properties of precipitation data does not support the claim that extreme short-duration rainfall events are becoming more frequent or intense.




Figure 6.6.1. Annual U.S. tornado counts for (a) strong to violent tornadoes (EF3 to EF5), and (b) weak tornadoes (EF0 to EF2). Based upon NOAA Storms Prediction Center data, available at https://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/data/1950-2024_actual_tornadoes.csv

6.5 Tornadoes

AR6 assesses tornado trends in the US as follows:

[O]bservational trends in tornadoes, hail, and lightning associated with severe convective storms are not robustly detected due to insufficient coverage of the long-term observations. There is *medium confidence* that the mean annual number of tornadoes in the USA has remained relatively constant. (Chapter 11, section 11.7.3, p. 1594)

The monitoring of weak tornadoes has changed over time. The growth of rural populations and the increasing ability to take video with hand-held devices has led to more frequent reports of weak tornadoes that produce minimal damage. In contrast, strong to violent tornadoes have been observed more consistently over time. Since statistics began in 1950, there has been a substantial decrease (by about 50%) in the number of strong to violent tornadoes as shown in Fig. 6.6.1a. Note that tornado strength is measured by the damage it produces, not by the visual appearance of the funnel. Limited real-time observational capabilities in earlier decades did not prevent identification because strong to violent tornadoes leave much more damage which will be assessed later even if the tornado itself was not observed.

To summarize, there is a noticeable downward trend in the number of severe tornadoes in the U.S. since 1950. After 1990 the number of weak tornadoes in the U.S. has remained roughly constant; data before that are incomplete due to limited monitoring.

6.6 Flooding

Changes in floods were assessed as follows:

AR6: The SREX **assessed *low confidence* for observed changes in the magnitude or frequency of floods** at the global scale. This assessment was confirmed by the AR5 report. The SR15 found increases in flood frequency and extreme streamflow in some regions, but decreases in other regions. . . [H]ydrological literature on observed flood changes is heterogeneous, focusing at regional and sub-regional basin scales, making it difficult to synthesise at the global and sometimes regional scales. (Chapter 11.5)

AR6: [T]he seasonality of floods has changed in cold regions where snowmelt dominates the flow regime in response to warming (*high confidence*). Confidence about peak flow trends over past decades on the global scale is *low*. (Chapter 11.5)

NCA4: Trends in extreme high values of streamflow are **mixed** across the United States. Analysis of 200 U.S. stream gauges indicates areas of both increasing and decreasing flooding magnitude **but does not provide robust evidence** that these trends are attributable to human influences (pp. 240-241)

The absence of detectable US-wide trends in flooding is consistent with the findings in Section 6.5 of absence of coherent changes in extreme precipitation.

6.7 Droughts

Assessments of drought trends were as follows.

AR6: Few AR6 regions show observed increases in meteorological drought (Section 11.9, p. 1575),

AR6: Increasing trends in agricultural and ecological droughts have been observed on all continents (*medium confidence*), but decreases only in one AR6 region (*medium confidence*). Increasing trends in hydrological droughts have been observed in a few AR6 regions. (Chapter 11 Summary)

NCA4: As a consequence of this increased precipitation, **drought statistics over the entire CONUS have declined**. (p. 233)

NCA4: Recent droughts and associated heat waves have reached record intensity in some regions of the United States; however, by geographical scale and duration, the Dust Bowl era of the **1930s remains the benchmark** drought and extreme heat event in the historical record (very high confidence). (p.231)

SREX: From a paleoclimate perspective, **recent droughts are not unprecedented**, with severe ‘megadroughts’ reported in the paleoclimatic record for Europe, North America, and Australia. (p. 170)




Figure 6.8.1: US dryness (%) 1895—2023. Source: NOAA
<https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/uspa/wet-dry/0>

As shown in Figure 6.8.1, US long term data shows an insignificantly declining trend toward extreme dryness (-0.001% per year)

Kogan et al. (2020) examines a 38-year high-resolution satellite-based drought measure and concludes that global drought has not intensified and is not connected to climate change: “it is possible to state firmly that global and main grain countries’ drought area and intensity trends have not been following global climate warming since 1980’s.”

In summary there is no evidence of increasing drought frequency or intensity in the U.S. or globally over recent decades.

6.8 Wildfires

The IPCC has not provided an assessment of wildfires. As shown in Figure 6.9.1, global wildfire activity as measured by European Space Agency shows a downward trend in the 21st century.




Figure 6.9.1: Global wildfire area 2001-2018. Source: From Lizundia-Loiola et al. (2021). The different coloured lines represent data products derived from different satellites and algorithms

Global data show that wildfire coverage is constant or declining on every continent (Samborska and Ritchie, 2024).

Active fire suppression since 1900 makes it difficult to establish a natural baseline for wildfire activity in the U.S. Paleoclimatic evidence indicates that past activity was much higher than today. Marlon et al. (2012) used sedimentary charcoal layers to reconstruct fire history of western US for the past 1400 years and also fit a model to predict fire activity as a function of climatic conditions. Their results are summarized in Figure 6.9.2 below (from Figure 2 in their paper). There has been a growing wildfire deficit over the 20th century. In other words, however much fire was observed in the 20th century, it was less than what would have been observed in previous centuries based on the climatic conditions. Parks et al. (2025) likewise find that despite the recent increase in wildfire burn area in North America, a significant wildfire deficit remains relative to historical wildfire regimes.




Figure 6.9.2 Fire frequency and fire deficit in the US. The red line shows the smoothed charcoal record and the black dotted line shows the predicted charcoal record based climatic conditions. model. Source: Copied from Marlon et al. (2012)

US data from the National Interagency Fire Centre (NIFC) from 1926 to 2023 are shown in Figure 6.9.3. The NIFC has removed the pre-1960 data from its current website on the grounds that measurement methods changed after 1960 making the comparison unreliable. Nonetheless just focusing on the post-1985 interval the number of fires is not increasing. The area burned did increase but only until about 2007.

Forest fires have always been a part of nature, and they can certainly create conditions that are inhospitable in the short term for all life including humans. Science has confirmed the overall benefit and necessity of the occurrence of forest fires. While recent high-profile fires and seasons serve as a reminder of the potential destructive impact, the highest profile forest fire remains the 1910 Big Blowup fire which destroyed over three million acres including the elimination of entire towns like Taft, MT (Apple, 2020). The 1910 fire reshaped the U.S. Forest Service (National Forest Foundation 2022) leading to a focus on fire suppression with a primary goal to defeat all forest fires (Forest History Society, 2022). This led to the 10 am rule in 1935 requiring that all fires spotted on any day had to be controlled by 10 am the following day (National Forest Foundation, 2022).

While defeating all fires seemed a noble goal, questions began to arise as to whether this behavior “followed the science” (US Forest Service, 2022). Over time the U.S. Forest Service has begun to rethink its goals, recognizing that new approaches such as prescribed burns, fuel elimination, and controlled wildfires are more appropriate (Sommer, 2016). Recent research is validating this approach and recognizing that more frequent smaller fires likely result in the healthier forests, water ecosystems and biodiversity (Stephens et al., 2021).




Figure 6.9.3: US wildfires 1926 to 2023. Source: Post-2018: National InterAgency Fire Center data
Pre-2017 webarchive.org.

References

- Apple, C. (2020, January 21). 1910 fire – The big burn across Montana and Idaho. *The Spokesman-Review*. <https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2020/jan/19/1910-fire-big-burn-across-montana-and-idaho/>
- Bell, Gerald D. and Muthuvel Chelliah, “Leading Tropical Modes Associated with Interannual and Multidecadal Fluctuations in North Atlantic Hurricane Activity,” *Journal of Climate* 19, no. 4 (February 15, 2006): 590–612, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3659.1>.
- Brewer, W. H. (1930). *Up and down California in 1860–1864: The journal of William H. Brewer*. University of California Press.
- Christy, J. R., Norris, W. B., and McNider, R. T. (2009). Surface temperature variations in East Africa and possible causes. *Journal of Climate*, 22(12), 3342–3356. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2726.1>
- Cohn, T. A. and Lins, H. F. (2005). Nature’s style: Naturally trendy. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(23). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL024476>
- Colorado State University. (2025). *Realtime tropical cyclone guidance*. <https://tropical.atmos.colostate.edu/Realtime/index.php>
- Forest History Society (2022). *The 1910 fires*. <https://foresthistor.org/research-explore/us-forest-service-history/policy-and-law/fire-u-s-forest-service/famous-fires/the-1910-fires/>
- Gershunov, A., and K. Guirguis (2012). California heat waves in the present and future. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(18). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL052979>
- Gershunov, A., T. Shulgina, F.M. Ralph, D.A. Lavers J.J. and Rutz (2017). Assessing the climate-scale variability of atmospheric rivers affecting western North America. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(15), 7900–7908. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL074175>
- Goldenberg, Stanley et al., “The Recent Increase in Atlantic Hurricane Activity: Causes and Implications,” *Science* 293, no. 5529 (July 20, 2001): 474–479, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1060040>.

- Howarth, M. E., C.D. Thorncroft, and L.F. Bosart (2019). Changes in extreme precipitation in the Northeast United States: 1979–2014. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 20(4), 673–689. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-18-0155.1>
- Hurst, H. E. (1951). Long term storage capacities of reservoirs. *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers*, 116, 776–808.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2021). *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (V. Masson-Delmotte et al., Eds.). Cambridge University Press. <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/>
- Jong, B.-T., H. Murakami, T.L. Delworth and W.F. Cooke (2024). Contributions of tropical cyclones and atmospheric rivers to extreme precipitation trends over the Northeast US. *Earth's Future*, 12, e2023EF004370. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023EF004370>
- Karl, T. R., C.N. Williams Jr., F.T. Quinlan, and T.A. Boden (1990). *United States Historical Climatology Network (HCN) serial temperature and precipitation data* (Publication No. 3404). Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- Klotzbach, Phil et al. (2018) Continental U.S. Hurricane Landfall Frequency and Associated Damage: Observations and Future Risks, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 99, no. 7 (July 2018): 1359–1376, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0184.1>.
- Kogan, Feliz, Wei Guob and Wenze Yang (2020) “Near 40-year drought trend during 1981-2019 earth warming and food security” *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk* Vol 11(1)
- Koutsoyiannis, D. (2013) Hydrology and Change. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 58(6) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.804626>
- Markonis, Y., and D. Koutsoyiannis (2016). Scale-dependence of persistence in precipitation records. *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 399–401. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2894>
- Marlon, Jennifer, Patrick J Bartlein, Daniel G. Gavin et al. (2012) Long-term perspective on wildfires in the western USA *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* February 14 2012 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1112839109>
- Maue, R. N. (2025). *Climatlas: Tropical cyclones*. <https://climatlas.com/tropical/>
- McKittrick, R., and J.R. Christy (2019). Assessing changes in US regional precipitation on multiple time scales. *Journal of Hydrology*, 578, 124074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124074>
- McKittrick, R., and J.R. Christy (2025), “Data and Code for DoE Report 2025”, Mendeley Data, V1, doi: 10.17632/8n9ks93vn7.1
- Null, J. and J. Hulbert, “California Washed Away: The Great Flood of 1862,” *Weatherwise* 60, no. 1 (2007): 26–30, <https://doi.org/10.3200/wewi.60.1.26-30>
- National Forest Foundation. (2022). *Blazing battles: The 1910 fire and its legacy*. <https://www.nationalforests.org/our-forests/your-national-forests-magazine/blazing-battles-the-1910-fire-and-its-legacy>
- National Interagency Fire Center. (2024). *Wildfire statistics*. <https://www.nifc.gov/fire-information/statistics/wildfires>
- NCA4. (2017). *Climate science special report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I* (D. J. Wuebbles, D. W. Fahey, and K. A. Hibbard, Eds.). U.S. Global Change Research Program. <https://doi.org/10.7930/J0J964J6>
- NCA5. (2023). *Fifth National Climate Assessment* (A. R. Crimmins et al., Eds.). U.S. Global Change Research Program. <https://doi.org/10.7930/NCA5.2023.CH1>
- NOAA Hurricane Research Division. (2025a). *All U.S. hurricanes (1851–2019)*. https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/hrd/hurdat/All_U.S._Hurricanes.html
- NOAA Hurricane Research Division. (2025b). *Most intense (3, 4, 5) continental United States hurricanes: 1851–1970, and 1983–2023*. https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/hrd/hurdat/most_intense.html
- Overland, J. E. (2021). Causes of the record-breaking Pacific Northwest heatwave, late June 2021. *Atmosphere*, 12(11), 1434. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12111434>

- Pan, M., M. Lu and U. Lall (2024). Diversity of cross-Pacific atmospheric river main routes. *Communications Earth and Environment*, 5, 378. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01552-y>
- Parks, Sean, Christopher Guiterman, Ellis Margolis et al. (2025) A fire deficit persists across diverse North American forests despite recent increases in area burned. *Nature Communications* 16 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-025-56333-8>
- Pielke, R. A., et al. (2011). Land use/land cover changes and climate: Modeling analysis and observational evidence. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2, 828–850. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.144>
- Porter, K., et al. (2011). *Overview of the ARkStorm scenario*. U.S. Geological Survey.
- Quinlan, F. T., T. R. Karl, and C.N. Williams Jr. (1987). *United States Historical Climatology Network (USHCN) serial temperature and precipitation data* (NDP-019). Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
- Seneviratne, S. et al. (2021) “Chapter 11: Weather and Climate Extreme Events in a Changing Climate.” In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, et al., 1513–1766. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.013>.
- Samborska, V., and H. Ritchie (2024). Wildfires. *Our World in Data*. <https://ourworldindata.org/wildfires>
- Sommer, L. (2016, November 7). Let it burn: The Forest Service wants to stop putting out some fires. *KQED*. <https://www.kqed.org/science/1134217/let-it-burn-the-forest-service-wants-to-stop-putting-out-some-fires>
- Stephens, Scott et al., (2021) “Fire, Water, and Biodiversity in the Sierra Nevada: A Possible Triple Win,” *Environmental Research Communications* 3, no. 8 (August 6, 2021): p. 081004, <https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ac17e2>.
- U.S. Forest Service. (2022). *Managing fire*. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/science-technology/fire>
- USGCRP. (2023). *USGCRP indicators platform: Heat waves*. <https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves>
- Vecchi, Gabriel A. and Thomas R. Knutson (2011) “Estimating Annual Numbers of Atlantic Hurricanes Missing from the HURDAT Database (1878–1965) Using Ship Track Density,” *Journal of Climate* 24, no. 6 (2011): 1736–1746, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010JCLI3810.1>.
- Villarini, Gabriele, Gabriel A. Vecchi, and James A. Smith, “U.S. Landfalling and North Atlantic Hurricanes: Statistical Modeling of Their Frequencies and Ratios,” *Monthly Weather Review* 140, no. 1 (January 2012): 44–65, <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-11-00063.1>.
- Web Archive. (n.d.). *Archive of NIFC fire data*. https://web.archive.org/web/20200212033452/https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_stats_totalFires.html
- Yang, L., Y. Yang, Y. Shen, et al. (2024). Urban development pattern’s influence on extreme rainfall occurrences. *Nature Communications*, 15, 3997. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-48533-5>
- Zhang, W., G. Villarini, G.A. Vecchi, and J.A. Smith, J. A. (2018). Urbanization exacerbated the rainfall and flooding caused by Hurricane Harvey in Houston. *Nature*, 563, 384–388. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0676-z>

7 CHANGES IN SEA LEVEL

Chapter Summary

Since 1900, global average sea level has risen by about 8 inches. Sea level change along U.S. coasts is highly variable, associated with local variations in processes that contribute to sinking and also ocean circulation patterns. The highest levels of sea level rise along U.S. coasts are Galveston, New Orleans, and the Chesapeake Bay regions - each of these locations is associated with substantial local land sinking (subsidence) unrelated to climate change.

Extreme projections of global sea level rise are associated with an implausible extreme emissions scenario and inclusion of poorly understood processes associated with hypothesized ice sheet instabilities. In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995-2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025 and at a lower rate than predicted. US tide gauge measurements shown herein reveal no obvious acceleration beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

7.1 Global sea level rise

Global sea level rise is arguably the most important climate impact driver that is unambiguously associated with increasing temperatures. At the global level, warming raises sea level through thermal expansion of the volume of sea water and through melting of glaciers and ice sheets. Variations in land water storage are another important factor. At the regional scale, sea level change is influenced by large-scale ocean circulation patterns, and geologic processes and deformation from the redistribution of ice and water. Locally, vertical land motion from geologic processes, ground water withdrawal, and fossil fuel extraction are also important.

The IPCC AR6 estimates that global mean sea level increased by 7.9 (5.9–9.8) inches between 1901 and 2018, with the rate of sea level rise accelerating in recent decades. At the ocean basin scale, sea levels have risen fastest in the Western Pacific and slowest in the Eastern Pacific over the period 1993–2018 (Fox-Kemper et al., 2021). The rate of global sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year (for reference, 0.12 in is the height of two stacked pennies) (NASA, 2020).

The observing systems for global sea level rise have advanced significantly in the satellite era, particularly with the advent of satellite altimeters since 1993. Local tide gauges have provided useful data for the past century, and even longer for a few locations. Following the end of the Little Ice Age in the mid-nineteenth century, tide gauges show that the global mean sea level began rising during the period 1820–1860, well before most anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions.

7.2 U.S. sea level rise

Observed and predicted rates of mean global sea level rise might have little scientific relevance for specific locations, owing to local processes (NOAA, 2025). Figure 7.1 shows that in Canada and Alaska (and also northern Washington), sea level is actually decreasing, owing to uplift from glacial rebound. Most of the Pacific coast tide gauges show rises between 0.12 inches/year, while largest U.S. rates are on the Gulf coast (Louisiana and Texas) and in the mid-Atlantic states (Chesapeake Bay region).




Figure 7.1. Map of rates of relative sea level rise along the U.S. coast (NOAA, <https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/>). For reference, 3 mm = 0.12 in.

Measurements of relative sea level rise from tide gauges conflate the climatologically relevant increase in the volume of seawater with local vertical land motion. That latter, which varies from place to place, is best measured using a Global Positioning System (GPS) station located near the tide gauge. It is driven by a range of processes that can be comparable to the climate signal and can locally exacerbate (subsidence/sinking) or mitigate (uplift) the risk of sea level rise (Wöppelmann and Marcos, 2016). Human activities triggering subsidence are often significant. They include soil drainage (e.g. for urban development purposes) and subsurface extraction of groundwater, oil, or gas.

Table 7.1 shows absolute sea-level rise (ASLR) for selected locations, determined from the sum of uncorrected sea-level rise as estimated from tide gauge time series (RSLR) (NOAA, 2025) and the vertical land motion (VLM) measurements (NAS, 2012; Letetrel et al., 2015; Karegar et al., 2016). The absolute sea level rise for each of these locations is significantly smaller than the measured relative sea level rise owing to local subsidence. More than half of the measured relative sea level rise is attributed to land sinking for these locations: San Francisco, Galveston, Grand Isle. For reference, the global average rate of absolute sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year.

Location	RSLR	VLM	ASLR
San Francisco, CA	+0.08	-0.06	+0.02
Galveston, TX	+0.26	-0.19	+0.07
Grand Isle, LA	+0.36	-0.28	+0.08
St Petersburg, FL	+0.12	-0.02	+0.10
New York City, NY	+0.11	-0.05	+0.06

Table 7.1 Absolute sea level rise (inches/year) consisting of Relative Sea Level Rise (RSLR) plus Vertical Land Motion (VLM))

San Francisco Bay

Over the past 100 years, relative sea level in the San Francisco Bay area has risen by 7.8 inches, at an average rate of 0.08 inches/year (Figure 7.2). As shown in Table 7.1, San Francisco’s vertical land motion is -0.06 inches/year (sinking), producing a recent absolute rate of +0.02 inches/year. Portions of Treasure Island, San Francisco International Airport, and Foster City are sinking as fast as 0.4 inches/year (Shirzaei and Bürgmann, 2018). Problems in the San Francisco Bay area, including threats to the airport, have been caused primarily by soil compaction in landfill zones that were formerly wetlands, not by the slow creep of global sea level rise.

Galveston - Houston

Long-term tide measurements at Galveston Pier 21 show sea level rise of 2.18 feet in the past century, or a rate of 0.26 inches/year (Figure 7.3). Vertical land motion (subsidence) at Galveston is estimated at -0.19 inches/year, yielding an absolute rate of rise of +0.07 inches/year (Table 7.1). The U.S. Geologic Survey found that most of the land-surface subsidence in the Houston-Galveston region is a direct result of groundwater withdrawals (Kasmarek and Ramage), which caused compaction of the aquifer sediments, mostly in the fine-grained silt and clay layers. By 1979, as much as 10 feet of subsidence had occurred in Houston.

Hurricanes have been the major concern in the region. The 1900 hurricane that struck Galveston and killed between 6,000 and 12,000 people is still considered the deadliest U.S. natural disaster (Weems, 2016). Hurricane Ike (2008) decimated large portions of the Bolivar Peninsula, literally removing significant portions of the land mass (UCS, 2017). While only 17 people were killed in Texas, property damage exceeded \$50 billion (White, 2017). In 2017, Hurricane Harvey struck the region, bringing catastrophic rainfall-triggered flooding that inflicted over \$125 billion in damages (NOAA, 2025).




Figure 7.2. Tide gauge measurements at San Francisco, California, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=9414290 (downloaded 4/22/25).




Figure 7.3. Tide gauge measurements Galveston Pier, TX, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8771450 (downloaded 4/22/2025).

New Orleans and the Mississippi delta

Long-term tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, Louisiana, show that sea level has risen by slightly more than 3 feet over the last 100 years at an average rate of 0.36 inches/year (Figure 7.4). Vertical land motion (subsidence) is estimated -0.28 inches/year. Table 7.1 gives the absolute sea level rise as +0.08 inches/year.




Figure 7.4. Tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, LA, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8761724 (downloaded 4/22/25).

The issues of sea level rise and land loss in the Mississippi Delta region are complex, with geological subsidence and the decline in sediment transported by the Mississippi river being the dominant drivers. The construction of dams in the basin since the 1950s has decreased the Mississippi's suspended sediment load by ~50% (Maloney 2018). A new subsidence map of coastal Louisiana finds the coastal region to be sinking at about one third of an inch per year (Neinhuis et al. 2017), associated with groundwater and resource withdrawal. As the city's elevation averages one to two feet *below* sea level, sea level rise from anthropogenic warming is hardly the dominant driver of New Orleans' problems.

New York City

New York City is particularly vulnerable to the effects of sea level rise because it is built primarily on islands and has 520 miles of coastline. Measurements by a tide gauge at the southern tip of Manhattan (The Battery) show that relative sea level has risen over 11 inches over the past century, at an average rate of 0.11 inches/year (Figure 7.5). But vertical land motion in the New York City area is -0.05 inches/year (roughly 5 inches per century), so that the absolute rate of sea level rise at The Battery is 0.06 inches/year, or about 55% of the measured relative sea level rise.




Figure 7.5. Tide gauge measurements at The Battery, New York, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8518750 (downloaded 4/22/25).

Following Superstorm Sandy, New York developed a comprehensive plan: *City of New York: Building a Stronger, More Resilient New York* (CNY, 2013). A broad range of coastal protection measures are outlined that match the risks facing the various zones: increase coastal edge elevations, minimize upland wave zones, infrastructure to protect against storm surge, improve coastal design and governance, restore estuaries wetlands, coastal nourishment, site elevation, and drainage systems.

7.3 Projected sea level rise

The concern over sea level rise is not about the roughly 8 inches of global rise since 1900. Rather, it is about projections of *accelerated* rise based upon simulations of a warming climate through the 21st Century.

The IPCC AR6 finds *high agreement* across published global mean sea level projections for 2050 with little sensitivity to emissions scenarios. Considering only projections incorporating ice-sheet processes in whose quantification there is at least *medium confidence*, the global sea level projections for 2050, across all emissions scenarios, fall between 3.94 and 15.75 inches (5th–95th percentile *very likely* range) relative to the 1995–2014 baseline period (Fox-Kemper et al., 2021).

Conversely, AR6 states there is *low agreement* across published global mean sea level projections for 2100, particularly for higher emissions scenarios. Considering only projections representing ice sheet processes in whose quantification there is at least *medium confidence*, the AR6 global mean sea level projections for 2100 lie between 7.87 and 39.37 inches (5th–95th percentile *very likely* range) under the medium emissions scenario SSP2–4.5 (Fox-Kemper et al., 2021). There is deep uncertainty surrounding projections of sea level rise to 2100 owing to uncertainties in ice sheet instabilities, particularly for the higher emissions scenarios.




Figure 7.6 Rate of sea level rise at the Battery in Manhattan. Shown is the historical thirty-year trailing trend, together with the allegedly “locked in” NOAA predicted trend for 2050. Historical data: NOAA Tides and Current.

In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995-2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025. From the tide gauge measurements in Figures 7.2-7.5, there is no obvious acceleration in sea level rise beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

In February 2022, NOAA issued its projections of sea level rise for various sites along the US coast (Sweet et al, 2022). They claim that by 2050, the sea will have risen one foot at The Battery in Manhattan. A one foot rise in thirty years would be more than twice the current rate and about three times the average rate over the past century. In that historical context, NOAA’s projection is remarkable—as shown in Figure 7.6, it would require a dramatic acceleration beyond anything observed in the early 20th century. But even more noteworthy is that they say this rise is “locked in”—it will happen no matter what future emissions are. We should know in a decade or so whether that prediction has legs.

References

- City of New York. (2013, June). *A stronger, more resilient New York*. http://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/sirr/SIRR_singles_Hi_res.pdf
- Fox-Kemper, B., Hewitt, H. T., Xiao, C., Adalgeirsdóttir, G., Drijfhout, S. S., Edwards, T. L., ... & Yu, Y. (2021). Ocean, cryosphere and sea level change. In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 1211–1362). Geneva, Switzerland: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Karegar, M. A., Dixon, T. H., & Engelhart, S. E. (2016). Subsidence along the Atlantic Coast of North America: Insights from GPS and late Holocene relative sea level data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43(7), 3126–3133. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068015>
- Kasmarek, M. C., & Ramage, J. K. (2017). *Water-level altitudes 2017 and water-level changes in the Chicot, Evangeline, and Jasper aquifers and compaction 1973–2016 in the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers, Houston-Galveston Region, Texas* (Scientific Investigations Report 2017–5080). U.S. Geological Survey. <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20175080>

- Letetrel, C., Becker, M., Llovel, W., & Cazenave, A. (2015). Estimation of vertical land movement rates along the coasts of the Gulf of Mexico over the past decades. *Continental Shelf Research*, 111(Part A), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2015.10.018>
- Maloney, J. M., Bentley, S. J., Xu, K., Obelcz, J., Georgiou, I. Y., & Miner, M. D. (2018). Mississippi River subaqueous delta is entering a stage of retrogradation. *Marine Geology*, 400, 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2018.03.001>
- National Academy of Science (NAS, 2012). *Sea-level rise for the coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, present, and future*. Appendix A: Vertical land motion and sea-level data along the West Coast of the United States. National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/13389/sea-level-rise-for-the-coasts-of-california-oregon-and-washington>
- NASA. (2020). *NASA sea level rise portal: 2020 edition*. <https://www.nasa.gov/specials/sea-level-rise-2020/>
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services. (n.d.). *Sea level trends*. <https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/>
- NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI). (2025). *U.S. billion-dollar weather and climate disasters*. <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/> <https://doi.org/10.25921/stkw-7w73>
- NOAA Tides & Currents. (n.d.). *Relative sea level trends*. <https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/>
- Nienhuis, J. H., Törnqvist, T. E., Esposito, C. R., Liang, M., & Ma, H. (2017). A new subsidence map for coastal Louisiana. *GSA Today*, 27(6), 28–29. <https://doi.org/10.1130/GSATG337GW.1>
- Shirzaei, M., & Bürgmann, R. (2018). Global climate change and local land subsidence exacerbate inundation risk to the San Francisco Bay Area. *Science Advances*, 4(3), eaap9234. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aap9234>
- Sweet, W. V., Hamlington, B. D., Kopp, R. E., et al. (2022). *Global and regional sea level rise scenarios for the United States* (USGS Report 70229139). United States Geological Survey. <https://www.usgs.gov/publications/global-and-regional-sea-level-rise-scenarios-united-states>
- Union of Concerned Scientists. (2017, June 23). *Galveston County, Texas, faces sea level rise and storms*. <https://www.ucs.org/resources/galveston-county-texas-faces-sea-level-rise-and-storms>
- Weems, J. E. (2016, March 15). *Galveston hurricane of 1900*. Texas State Historical Association. <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/galveston-hurricane-of-1900>
- Wöppelmann, G., & Marcos, M. (2016). Vertical land motion as a key to understanding sea level change and variability. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 54, 64–92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015RG000502>

MISSING REFERENCE: White 2017

8 UNCERTAINTIES IN CLIMATE CHANGE ATTRIBUTION

Chapter summary

“Attribution” refers to determining cause regarding some aspect of climate change, specifically with reference to anthropogenic activity. There is an ongoing scientific debate around attribution methods, particularly regarding extreme weather events. Attribution is made difficult by high natural variability, the relatively small expected anthropogenic signal, lack of high-quality data, and reliance on deficient climate models. The IPCC has long cautioned that methods to establish causality in climate science are inherently uncertain and ultimately depend on expert judgement.

Substantive criticism of the main IPCC assessments of the role of CO₂ in recent warming focus on inadequate assessment of natural climate variability, uncertainties in measurement of solar variability and aerosol forcing, and problems in the statistical methods used for attribution.

The IPCC does not in general make attribution claims for most climate impact drivers related to extreme events. Statements related to statistics of global extremes (e.g. event probability or return times, magnitude and frequency) are not generally considered accurate owing to data limitations and are made with low confidence. Attribution of individual extreme weather events is challenging due to their rarity. Conflicting claims about the causes of the 2021 Western North America Heatwave illustrate the perils of hasty attribution claims about individual extreme events.

8.1 Introduction

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) distinguishes between detection of climate change and attribution of its cause. As defined by the IPCC AR6 WGI Glossary (IPCC, 2025):

Detection: Detection of change is defined as the process of demonstrating that climate or a system affected by climate has changed in some defined statistical sense, without providing a reason for that change. An identified change is detected in observations if its likelihood of occurrence by chance due to internal variability alone is determined to be small, for example, <10%.

Attribution: Attribution is defined as the process of evaluating the relative contributions of multiple causal factors to a change or event with a formal assessment of confidence.

Both steps rely on statistical analysis. Detection focuses on whether changes are significant enough to stand out from random variation regardless of cause. Attribution involves comparison of observed events to model-generated counterfactuals. Since experimentation on the climate is not possible, attribution requires statistical inference to assess how much human activities, such as GHG emissions, versus natural factors, like volcanic eruptions, contribute to observed changes. Attribution methods assume all external and internal drivers of the system are known and represented.

There are ongoing scientific debates around attribution methods, especially those for attributing extreme weather events to climate change. The IPCC has long cautioned that methods to establish causality in climate science are inherently uncertain and ultimately depend on expert judgement. AR4 Working Group I (Hegerl et al., 2007) explained it as follows:

‘Attribution’ of causes of climate change is the process of establishing the most likely causes for the detected change with some defined level of confidence... unequivocal attribution would require controlled experimentation with the climate system. Since that is not possible, in practice attribution of anthropogenic climate change is understood to mean demonstration that a detected change is ‘consistent with the estimated responses to the given combination of anthropogenic and natural forcing’ and ‘not consistent with alternative, physically plausible explanations of recent climate change that exclude important elements of the given combination of forcings’ (IPCC, 2001)... The approaches used in detection and attribution research described above cannot fully account for all uncertainties, and thus ultimately expert judgement is required to give a calibrated assessment of whether a specific cause is responsible for a given climate change.

AR5 Working Group II (Cramer et al., 2014) makes the following statement:

Two broad challenges to the detection and attribution of climate change impacts relate to observations and process understanding. On the observational side, high-quality, long-term data relating to natural and human systems and the multiple factors affecting them are rare. In addition, the detection and attribution of climate change impacts requires an understanding of the processes by which climate change, in conjunction with other factors, may affect the system in question.

Because of the complexity of the causal chains in the climate system, investigation of these relationships is exceptionally challenging.

8.2 Attribution methods

The IPCC employs several attribution methods to assess the causes of observed climate changes, distinguishing between natural and human-induced factors. Below is a concise description of the key methods that have been used by the IPCC.

Optimal Fingerprinting uses linear regression to explain variations in observed climate data as a weighted sum of climate model simulations run with and without anthropogenic forcings. The data used in the regression model are weighted to try to minimize the influence of random noise and the estimation method is chosen to take account of climate model error.

Time Series Analysis exploits statistical differences between anthropogenic forcing and natural variability to see which dominates observed temperatures, and also uses variations in the timing of changes to determine if causal dependence across data series can be inferred.

Process-Based Attribution focuses on understanding the physical mechanisms behind observed changes. This approach combines observations, climate models, and theoretical understanding to attribute changes in specific processes to forcings. This approach is often used for regional climate phenomena, such as monsoon changes or polar amplification

Extreme Event Attribution assesses the role of human influence in the likelihood of occurrence or intensity of extreme weather events (e.g. heat waves, droughts). Methods include:

- Probabilistic Event Attribution uses large ensembles of climate model simulations to compare observed events to model-generated counterfactuals
- Storyline Approach examines the physical processes driving an event and evaluates how anthropogenic forcings might have modified those processes

8.3 Attribution of global warming

Attribution statements for global warming in the three most recent IPCC Assessment reports are:

AR4: Most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations. (IPCC 2007)

AR5: It is *extremely likely* that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in greenhouse gas concentrations and other anthropogenic forcings together. The best estimate of the human- induced contribution to warming is similar to the observed warming over this period. (IPCC 2013)

AR6: The *likely* range of total human-caused global surface temperature increase from 1850–1900 to 2010–2019 is 0.8°C to 1.3°C, with a best estimate of 1.07°C. It is *likely* that well-mixed GHGs contributed a warming of 1.0°C to 2.0°C, other human drivers (principally aerosols) contributed a cooling of 0.0°C to 0.8°C, natural drivers changed global surface temperature by –0.1°C to +0.1°C, and internal variability changed it by –0.2°C to +0.2°C. It is *very likely* that well-mixed GHGs were the main driver of tropospheric warming since 1979. (IPCC 2021)

The AR4 and AR5 attribution statements reference the warming since the mid-20th century, the period when greenhouse gas emissions began rapidly increasing. The words “most” and “more than half” are deliberately imprecise, potentially ranging from 51 to 99% of the warming – presumably this imprecision is to account for structural uncertainties such as natural internal variability. The confidence level increases from *very likely* to *extremely likely* from AR4 to AR5. The structure of the attribution statement in the AR6 is fundamentally different, referencing the warming to the period 1850-1900. The AR6 attribution statement is more precise numerically, but with a lower level of confidence at “likely” – the AR6 attributes essentially all the warming to increases in greenhouse gases. The most confident statement from the AR6 relates to the tropospheric warming since 1979, using the words “main driver” and “*very likely*.”

There are three areas of substantive criticism of the IPCC’s assessment of the causes of the recent warming: inadequate assessment of natural climate variability, inappropriate statistical methods, and substantial discrepancies between models and observations. The last is discussed in Chapter 6, while this chapter discusses the first two factors. All of these criticisms are relevant to the IPCC’s policy-informing attribution of the recent warming, which also underpins extreme event attribution

8.3.1 Natural climate variability

IPCC AR6 states that natural external drivers since 1850-1900 have changed global surface temperature by –0.1°C to +0.1°C, and internal variability has changed it by –0.2°C to +0.2°C – on average having essentially no net impact on the warming since 1850-1900. As discussed below, this minimal contribution of natural variability has been disputed by several publications that question the magnitudes of solar variability and internal variability from large-scale ocean circulation.

Solar variability

IPCC AR5 concluded that the best estimate of radiative forcing due to Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) changes over the period 1750–2011 was very small (0.05 W/m², Myrhe et al., 2014). IPCC AR6 acknowledges a much larger range of estimates of changes in TSI over the last several centuries, stating that the TSI between the Maunder Minimum (1645–1715) and the second half of the twentieth century increased by 0.7–2.7 W/m², a range that includes both low and high variability TSI data sets (Gulev, 2021).

However, the recommended forcing dataset for the CMIP6 climate model simulations used in AR6 for attribution studies averages two data sets with low solar variability (Matthes, 2017).

While AR6 shows a substantially greater solar impact than does AR5, the overall impact on the climate was still assessed to be small compared to anthropogenic forcing of climate change. However, the impact of solar variations on the climate is uncertain and subject to substantial debate - something that is not evident from the IPCC assessment reports (Lockwood, 2012; Connolly et al., 2021).

The change of TSI over time remains a challenging problem. Since 1978, there have been direct measurements of TSI from satellites. However, the data exhibits non-negligible inconsistencies, and interpreting any multi-decadal trends in TSI requires comparisons of observations from overlapping satellites. There are several rival composite TSI datasets, disagreeing as to whether TSI increased or decreased during the period 1986–96 (the ACRIM gap; see Chapter 4). Further, the satellite record of TSI is used to calibrate proxy models, whereby past solar variations are inferred from sunspots and cosmogenic isotope measurements (Velasco Herrera et al., 2015).

There is substantial evidence for high solar activity in the second half of the 20th century (starting in 1959) and extending into the 1990's, before a decline in the early 21st century; this period is often termed the “Modern Maximum.” (Chatzistergos et al., 2023; Solanki et al., 2004; Usoskin et al., 2007). However, some scientists have concluded that it is not possible to be confident of any multi-decadal trend in TSI (Schmutz, 2021).

This uncertainty causes some reconstructions of TSI from 1750 to have low variability (implying a very low impact of solar variations on global mean surface temperature) whereas datasets with high TSI variability can explain more than 70% percent of the temperature variability since preindustrial times (Scafetta, 2013; Stefani, 2021). The choice of TSI satellite record used in an analysis can therefore substantially influence how much climate change is attributed to human versus natural forcings.

There is growing evidence that other aspects of solar variability, which are referred to as solar indirect effects, either amplify TSI forcing or are independent of TSI forcing. Scafetta et al. (2023) suggests that ~80% of solar influence on climate may stem from non-TSI mechanisms. There are numerous candidate processes, including solar ultraviolet changes; energetic particle precipitation; atmospheric-electric-field effect on cloud cover; cloud changes produced by solar-modulated galactic cosmic rays; large relative changes in the magnetic field; and the strength of the solar wind. Such solar indirect effects are not included in climate models, although indirect methods of estimating their impacts suggest they are significant. However, claims of non-TSI mechanisms influencing climate are uncertain and debated.

Natural variability of large-scale ocean circulations

Variations in global mean surface temperature are linked to recurrent large-scale variations in ocean circulation patterns, including the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the El Nino-Southern Oscillation (ENSO). These circulations influence ocean heat uptake and heat distribution, and also influence atmospheric circulation patterns and cloud distributions. There is some debate as to whether these variations are strictly internal to the climate system, or whether this variability can have a solar/astronomical origin or can be influenced by large volcanic eruptions.

While climate models simulate the large-scale ocean circulations and internal climate variability, most models show have too little amplitude compared to observations at multi-decadal frequencies and phasing out-of-sync with the observed climate (Kravtsov et al. 2024). Averaging multiple simulations effectively averages out the internal variations, leaving only the forced climate variability (e.g., CO₂ forcing). With most of the modern warming beginning in the late 1970's, the recent 50-year warming is on the same time scale as the multi-decadal oscillations of the AMO and PDO.

Here are summary statements from the IPCC AR5 and AR6 reports:

AR5: Decadal variability in the Pacific, associated with the PDO or IPO [Interdecadal Pacific Oscillation], contributes significantly to regional and global temperature trends, but the relative contributions of internal variability and external forcing are difficult to disentangle in CMIP5 simulations.

AR6: Since AR5, there has been increased understanding of the role of internal variability, such as ENSO, PDO, and AMO, in modulating regional climate trends. However, limitations in simulating the exact timing and amplitude of these modes in CMIP6 models contribute to uncertainties in attributing observed changes to anthropogenic forcing (*high confidence*).

The amplitude of the peak-to-trough impact of the multi-decadal oscillations on global temperatures has been assessed by the IPCC AR6: “The likely range of change due to internal variability is -0.2°C to $+0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$ (IPCC, 2021).” This implies a trough-to-peak change of 0.4°C . Over many centuries, any global temperature changes from the troughs and peaks will cancel out, with little to no net impact.

However, with a nominal timescale of 60-80 years for oscillations such as the AMO and PDO, the timing of the peaks and troughs can be confused with the secular trend. This becomes very relevant for attributing the warming for the past 50 years, when most of the recent warming has occurred. Even if climate models have the correct amplitude of the multidecadal oscillations, the timing of the peaks and troughs is not adequately simulated, with each model and individual ensemble simulating a different phasing. Once the simulations of the ensemble members and different models are averaged, the natural internal variability contribution is averaged out, effectively cancelling the role of natural internal variability in the attribution process.

The time series of global surface temperature anomalies since 1850 (Figure 8.1) shows irregular variations of significant amplitude against the background of an overall warming trend and, after 1976, a pronounced difference in trends between the Northern Hemisphere and the Southern Hemisphere. The period between 1905-1945 shows a strong trend of warming. The following thirty years from 1945-1976 showed slightly declining temperatures. The most recent warming period started in 1977.




Figure 8.1 Global average surface temperature anomalies 1850—2025. Top: Northern hemisphere. Middle: Southern hemisphere. Bottom: Global average. Source: UK Hadley Centre <https://crudata.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/temperature/HadCRUT5.0Analysis.pdf>

The causes of the early 20th century warming are discussed by Hegerl et al. (2017; 2019). The atmospheric CO₂ concentration increased from 298 ppm in 1905 to 310 ppm in 1941; hence this implies that CO₂ had little impact on the warming. Volcanic activity during this period was very low, and solar forcing is uncertain. Hegerl et al (2017) somehow inferred that 40-54% of this warming could be attributed to external forcing, with the rest associated with internal variability. Bronniman et al (2024) focused on the causes of the cooling in the first decade of the 20th century in the Southern Hemisphere. They found that the cooling was related to a La-Niña-like pattern in the Pacific, a cold tropical and subtropical South Atlantic, a cold extratropical South Pacific, and cool southern midlatitude land areas. The Southern Annular Mode was positive, with a strengthened Amundsen–Bellingshausen seas low, although the spread of the data products is considerable.

The warming in the 1930's and subsequent cooling during mid century was particularly pronounced in the Arctic. Bokuchava and Semenov (2021) find that most likely these variations were caused by a combined effect of long-term natural climate variations in the North Atlantic and North Pacific with a contribution of the natural radiative forcing related to the reduced volcanic activity and variations of solar activity as well as growing greenhouse gases concentrations. Tokinaga et al (2017) showed that the combined effect of internally generated Pacific and Atlantic interdecadal variability intensified Arctic

warming in the early 20th century. The synchronized Pacific-Atlantic warming drastically alters planetary-scale circulations over the Northern Hemisphere; these same circulation patterns have a global influence.

The cooling period between 1945 and 1976 has been referred to as the “grand hiatus.” Numerous causes have been hypothesized: natural internal variability from fluctuations associated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation; cooling from increased emissions of aerosols from industrial activities; increased heat uptake in the Atlantic, Southern and Equatorial Pacific Oceans. Thompson et al. (2010) find that the hemispheric differences in temperature trends in the middle of the twentieth century stem largely from a rapid drop in Northern Hemisphere sea surface temperatures of about 0.3 °C between about 1968 and 1972.

The Great Pacific Climate Shift of 1976-1977 was a notable climatic event characterized by an abrupt change in the North Pacific Ocean's atmosphere-ocean system that interacted with global climate patterns. This shift is closely associated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) that oscillates between warm and cool phases over decades. The 1976 shift marked a transition from a predominantly negative (cool) PDO phase (1947–1976) to a positive (warm) phase (1977 through 2000), with significant implications for global and regional climate patterns including the frequencies of El Nino and La Nina events. The Great Pacific Climate Shift coincided with the beginning of a period of accelerated global warming. When the Great Pacific Climate Shift is accounted for in climate attribution analyses since 1950, 40 percent or more of the warming in the second half of the 20th century is attributed to natural internal variability (McLean et al., 2009; Tung and Zhou, 2013; Chylek et al., 2016; Scafetta, 2021).

8.3.2 *Optimal fingerprinting*

Optimal fingerprinting is a statistical technique introduced by Allen and Tett (1999) that compares observed climate data to climate model simulations to identify patterns (or “fingerprints”) associated with human or natural forcing. It involves taking a vector of observed climate changes, such as warming rates in locations around the world, and decomposing them into a weighted sum of “signals”, which are analogues to the observations generated by climate models with different types of forcings. The weights are chosen using a regression method called Total Least Squares. The analysis commonly uses just two signals, one generated by models using only anthropogenic forcings and one using only natural forcings. If the estimated weighting coefficient attached to a signal is significantly different from zero, then that signal is said to be “detected”. If it is close to 1.0, then the model generating the signal is said to be consistent with observations. If it is less than 1.0, then the model signal for that forcing is too strong and needs to be scaled down, and vice-versa. Both the observed data and the signals are weighted using a model-generated estimate of patterns of randomness in the climate system so as, in principle, to put maximum weight on regions where natural variability is minimized.

Optimal fingerprinting is the primary tool for attribution in the research literature. While it has been widely used and prominently featured by the IPCC since 2001 there is very little literature examining the statistical properties of the results it generates. One of its inherent weaknesses is that results depend on assumptions about the accuracy of climate models, especially regarding their representation of natural variability (IPCC AR5 Ch 10.2.3).

A series of papers by McKittrick (McKittrick 2021, 2022, 2023, 2025) has challenged the optimal fingerprinting method, arguing that it is inherently unreliable and that practices adopted from econometrics can provide more valid results. Statistical theory requires that for regression models to yield unbiased coefficients, a set of assumptions called the Gauss-Markov conditions must hold. McKittrick (2021) argued that the Allen and Tett (1999) methodology violates the Gauss-Markov conditions, leading to potentially biased and inconsistent fingerprinting coefficients, undermining the reliability of the method. Chen et al. (2023) confirmed this analysis and argued that the method could yield unbiased results but only under very stringent assumptions. McKittrick (2022) and (2023) raised a further concern that climate scientists—virtually alone among

scientific disciplines—have used an estimation method called Total Least Squares (TLS) to estimate anthropogenic greenhouse gas signal coefficients, despite its tendency to be unreliable unless some strong assumptions hold that in practice are unlikely to be true. Under conditions that easily arise in optimal fingerprinting, TLS yields estimates with large positive biases. Thus, any study that used TLS for optimal fingerprinting without verifying its applicability in the specific data context has likely overstated the result.

McKittrick (2025) presented an empirical example comparing the results of conventional optimal fingerprinting against methods drawn from mainstream econometrics that are known to be valid for the specific application of signal detection. While the IPCC optimal fingerprinting method yields an anthropogenic signal coefficient close to 1.0 on a global temperature data set spanning 1900 to 2010, consistent estimation yields a coefficient around 0.4, which rises to about 0.65 on data spanning 1980 to 2010, implying the model response to greenhouse gases needs to be scaled down by about half to optimally match observations. The natural forcing signal coefficient, by contrast, is between 2.0 and 4.0, implying the climate model signals of natural forcing need to be scaled up two-to four-fold to match observed climate change. The fingerprinting coefficients estimated in McKittrick (2025), when used to scale the average sensitivity of the climate models used to generate the forcing signals in his data set, imply a Transient Climate Sensitivity of 1.4°C, which is consistent with the estimate by Lewis (2023) using a different estimation method and multiple independent data sets.

While these analyses do not falsify all results stemming from the IPCC optimal fingerprinting method, they do challenge the basis on which they were believed to be correct.

8.3.3 Time series methods

The IPCC (AR5 WGI 10.2.2) drew attention to alternative approaches of assessing causality that emerged from the time series econometrics literature. These have the advantage of not depending on assumptions about the accuracy of climate models, but the disadvantage that they depend on difficult-to-test assumptions about the data generating process underlying climate and forcing data. The methods, now referred to as climate econometrics, use the tools of unit root testing, Granger causality and cointegration analysis, all of which are familiar in economics and finance and which are slowly being adopted in climate science. Time series analysis methods hold out the possibility of determining whether anthropogenic or natural forcings are the primary drivers of climate change without requiring the use of climate models, although key questions remain unsettled (e.g. Dergiades et al., 2016, Balcombe et al., 2019, Dagsvik et al., 2020, Razzak, 2022, Dagsvik and Moen, 2023).

“Granger causality” modeling is a tool for determining directions of influence in data series that move together. It is a statistical, not a physical, concept. If knowing the current value of one variable significantly improves the forecast accuracy of another variable we can infer a causal connection exists; this is called Granger causality. The modeling tools, called vector autoregression, measure direct impulse-response patterns and feedbacks. An application to the well-known Vostok ice core data revealed an error in Al Gore’s documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*. Gore showed the data and drew attention to the coherence of temperature and CO₂ changes over a 440,000 year span, which he asserted was due to CO₂ driving temperature changes. But temperature changes can also affect atmospheric CO₂ levels. Davidson et al. (2015) examined the series and found that temperature Granger causes CO₂ but not the reverse. In other words on the time scales represented in the Vostok data the coherence in the series is primarily due to the influence of temperature on CO₂ levels not the feedback of CO₂ levels on temperature.

In summary, the primary statistical methods for attributing causation in climate data are optimal fingerprinting and time series analysis. Applications of the Allen and Tett (1999) optimal fingerprinting method dominate the attribution literature and have underpinned past IPCC conclusions, but results depend on the accuracy of climate models and the method has recently been criticized as inherently biased. Time

series methods do not depend on climate models but require assumptions of their own and have generated results that have thus far not converged on a consensus.

8.4 Declining planetary albedo and recent record warmth

A sharp recent increase in global average temperatures has raised the question of short-term drivers of climate. One such candidate is the fraction of absorbed solar radiation which has also changed abruptly in recent years. The question to be answered is whether the change is an internal feedback to warming caused by greenhouse gases or whether something else changed the fraction of absorbed radiation which then caused the recent warming.

The albedo is the fraction of incoming solar radiation that is reflected back into space rather than being absorbed by the planet. Highly reflective surfaces like cloud tops and snow and ice are most important in this regard. The Earth's albedo is approximately 30%, meaning almost a third of the sunlight that reaches Earth is directly reflected back to space. A lower albedo implies more solar energy is absorbed by the planet to be then re-radiated as heat. Hence, other things being equal, a decline in albedo is associated with a warming of the Earth.

Arguably the most striking change in the Earth's climate system during the 21st century is a significant reduction in planetary albedo since 2015, which has coincided with at least two years of record global warmth. Figure 8.2 shows the planetary albedo variations since 2000, when there are good satellite observations. The 0.5% reduction in planetary albedo since 2015 corresponds to an increase of 1.7 W/m² in solar energy averaged over the planet (Hansen and Karecha, 2025). For comparison, the IPCC estimate of forcing from the increase in atmospheric CO₂ compared to preindustrial times is approximately 2.2 W/m² (Figure 3.1.2).

Looking back prior to 2000 with less adequate data, Goessling et al. (2025) assessed that planetary albedo was relatively low around the 1940's and 50's, before rising industrial aerosol precursor emissions increased albedo until the 1980's. The strongest planetary albedo excursions were high-albedo episodes caused by volcanic eruptions, such as after the Mount Pinatubo eruption in 1991. Although uncertain, the 2023 planetary albedo minimum may have been the lowest since at least 1940.

Changes in surface characteristics can't explain this decrease in planetary albedo since 2015:

- Arctic sea ice extent has declined by about 5% since 1980 (https://nsidc.org/data/seaice_index/images/s_plot_hires.png), although following 2007 there has been a pause in the Arctic sea ice decline (England et al., 2025)
- Regarding Antarctic sea ice, the IPCC AR6 concludes that “There has been no significant trend in Antarctic sea ice area from 1979 to 2020 due to regionally opposing trends and large internal variability.” (Summary for Policymakers, A.1.5)
- Northern hemispheric annual snow cover has been slowly declining since 1967, with barely significant trends. The data show the Northern Hemisphere has snowier winters, accompanied by more rapid melt in spring and summer. <http://climate.rutgers.edu/snowcover/>
- Global greening (Chapter 2) is contributing to the decrease in planetary albedo, as forests have a lower albedo than open lands or snow. However, there is some evidence that forests increase cloud cover (high reflectivity), which counteracts the direct albedo increase associated with increasing forested area.




Figure 8.2. Earth's albedo (reflectivity, in percent), with seasonality removed. From Hansen and Karecha (2025)

Changes in surface reflectivity are contributing to a small, slow decline in planetary albedo. However, these changes cannot explain the sharp decline in planetary albedo beginning in 2015. Further, any changes in surface albedo are effectively damped by about a factor 3 on average, primarily due to cloud masking (Loeb et al. 2019). Surface albedo changes have thus contributed only weakly to the recent planetary albedo decline, particularly when averaged annually and globally.

This leaves the most likely explanation for the sharp albedo decline as changes in atmospheric aerosols and/or clouds.

Aerosols are small particles in the atmosphere that reflect sunlight and can interact with cloud processes to make the clouds more reflective. Aerosols have both natural origins (e.g dust from soils, wildfires) as well as human origins from combustion (including fossil fuels). Regions that are greening and/or have an increase in rainfall may be producing less dust. For anthropogenic aerosols, new ship fuel regulations aimed at reducing sulfur emissions were implemented in three phases, in 2010, 2015 and 2020. Sulfate particles reflect solar radiation. Cleaner air means less solar radiation is reflected, which contributes to surface warming. Indirect effects of sulfate aerosols include increasing the reflectivity of low-level clouds in the subtropics. There is controversy surrounding the importance of this change in sulfate emissions to the Earth's radiation balance (Hodnebrog et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024), but the restriction of this effect to major shipping routes suggests a small global impact (Schmidt, 2024).

Changes in clouds are the primary candidate to explain the decline in global albedo since 2015. Two recent papers (Loeb et al., 2024; Goessling et al 2024) have addressed recent variations in cloud properties. By considering satellite and reanalysis data, Loeb et al. found that decreases in low and mid-level clouds since 2015 are the primary reason for decreasing planetary albedo in the Northern hemisphere, whereas in the Southern hemisphere the decrease in planetary albedo is primarily due to decreases in mid-level clouds across all latitude zones. Goessling et al. (2024) found that cloud anomalies were mainly due to reduced low-level clouds. Regions with coherent low-level cloud reductions over the past decade include the warm pool region around the Maritime Continent and the northern extratropical western Pacific, as well as large parts of the Atlantic and adjacent land regions. The reduction of global cloud cover identified in these analyses since 2015 is 1-2 percent.

The question then becomes what caused the change in cloud cover. Two causes have been posited for the declining cloud cover over the past decade:

- Natural climate variability
- Changes in low cloud cover associated with warming sea surface temperatures, implying an emerging positive feedback to climate change (Hansen and Karecha, 2025)

The existence of a new positive low cloud feedback that began emerging in 2015 is not easy to justify. However, there are numerous natural climate signals during this period that are associated with atmospheric circulation changes that can influence the distribution of clouds:

- The 2014-2016 was the strongest El Nino event on record
- A cold anomaly beginning in 2015 in the subpolar gyre of the North Atlantic reflects a shift in the ocean circulation pattern associated with decadal variability in the Atlantic (Frajka-Williams et al., 2017; Arthun et al. 2021).
- The Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) positive index peaked in 2016, then declined and has been in negative territory since late 2019
- Eruption of the submarine Hunga-Tonga volcano in 2022

Interannual cloud anomalies associated with the El Nino Southern Oscillation (ENSO) have a significant global signal and strong regional signals especially over the tropical Indian and Pacific Oceans.

The Hunga Tonga eruption is remarkable in its coincidence with the exceptionally low value of planetary albedo in 2023. Goessling et al. (2024) found that the cloud perturbations in 2023 showed a different pattern from the overall pattern since 2015, with reduced cloud cover being most pronounced in the northern hemisphere and tropics. Regional reductions in cloud cover were most pronounced over the eastern Indian Ocean, over South America and extending over the eastern Pacific, as well as over northern North America, in the Southern Ocean around 60S, in the subtropical and eastern North Atlantic, and in parts of the North Pacific.

The Hunga Tonga eruption was unusual in that it injected large amounts of water vapor into the stratosphere, in addition to sulfate particles. Early publications focused on the impacts to stratospheric circulations and the direct radiative impact. In 2025, papers are emerging that examine the indirect effects of Hunga Tonga on surface climate using ensemble simulations from earth system models (Bednarz et al, 2025; Kuchar et al., 2025). These papers found statistically significant impacts on regional climates that were driven by circulation changes from couplings between the stratosphere and troposphere. These papers indicate the complex interactions between volcanic activity and climate dynamics. More research is needed to untangle any impacts of Hunga Tonga eruption on planetary albedo.

In summary, the decline in planetary albedo and the concurrent decline in cloudiness have emphasized the importance of clouds and their variations to global climate variability and change. A change of 1 to 2 percent in global cloud cover has a greater radiative impact on the climate than the direct radiative effect of doubling CO₂. While it is difficult to untangle causes of the trend, the competing explanations for the cause of the declining cloud cover have substantial implications for assessing the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity and also the attribution of the recent warming. An additional 10 years of data should help clarify whether this is a strong positive cloud feedback associated with warming, or a temporary fluctuation driven by natural variability

8.5 Attribution of climate impact drivers

The IPCC (Ranasinghe et al. 2021) defines “climate impact drivers” or CIDs as “physical climate system conditions (e.g., means, events, extremes) that affect an element of society or ecosystems.” Hence CIDs are those features of the weather and climate system of primary interest in assessing the impacts of

climate change since they potentially affect humans and the natural world. For instance, under the heading “Heat and Cold” CIDs are identified as mean air temperature, extreme heat, cold spells and frost. The IPCC also points out that CIDs are not necessarily harm-related: depending on the system in question they can be detrimental, neutral, beneficial or a combination.

The first column of Table 12.12 in Ranasinghe et al. (2021, p. 1856), reproduced here as Table 8.1, summarizes the AR6 assessment of whether a signal of attributable anthropogenic influence has emerged across all major CIDs. One of the themes of this chapter is that attribution methods used by the IPCC tend to overstate the anthropogenic influence and understate the role of natural variability. Nonetheless a striking feature of that summary table is how few CIDs exhibit an anthropogenic signal sufficient to distinguish them from natural variability.

Out of the 33 weather impact categories an anthropogenic signal is asserted with *high confidence* in only five, and with *medium confidence* in a further four. (Note that one of the CIDs is an increase in CO₂ levels, and since it is a tautology to attribute this to increased CO₂ levels this CID can be ignored.) For the rest the IPCC does not claim to have detected anthropogenic drivers. Of the five *high confidence assertions*, two are for changes in average temperatures (air and ocean) hence are not measures of extreme weather. Also two of the four *medium confidence* assertions are related to ocean chemistry and thus are likewise not related to extreme weather. The IPCC does not assert a human influence on many non-temperature weather features such as wind, precipitation, flooding, drought etc.

Columns 2 and 3 of IPCC Table 12.12 report on whether anthropogenic signals are expected to emerge this century under RCP8.5, the most extreme forcing scenario. We have omitted these columns for several reasons. First, because they refer to whether climate models project detectable signals in the observations, which is a very different question than our concern here, whether a signal has been detected in historical data. Second, as we discuss in Chapter 4, the RCP8.5 scenario is a misleading and implausible high-end storyline, it is not a “base case” or business-as-usual projection. Third, the ensemble of detailed models is acknowledged (Palmer and Stevens 2019) to be “not fit for purpose” in describing regional changes and “unable to represent future conditions at the degree of spatial, temporal, and probabilistic precision with which projections are often provided.” (Nissan et al, 2019)). Even with these caveats, we note that the omitted columns in AR6 Table 12.12 indicate most weather impacts are not expected to exhibit an anthropogenic signal this century.

Climatic Impact-driver Type	Climatic Impact-driver Category	Already Emerged in Historical Period
Heat and Cold	Mean air temperature	1
	Extreme heat	2
	Cold spell	4
	Frost	
Wet and Dry	Mean precipitation	
	River flood	
	Heavy precipitation and pluvial flood	
	Landslide	
	Aridity	
	Hydrological drought	
	Agricultural and ecological drought	
Wind	Few weather	
	Mean wind speed	
	Severe wind storm	
	Tropical cyclone	
Snow and Ice	Sand and dust storm	
	Snow, glacier and ice sheet	
	Permafrost	
	Lake, river and sea ice	11
	Heavy snowfall and ice storm	
	Wail	
Coastal	Snow avalanche	
	Relative sea level	
	Coastal flood	
	Coastal erosion	
Open Ocean	Mean ocean temperature	
	Marine heatwaves	
	Ocean acidity	
	Ocean salinity	13
	Dissolved oxygen	14
Other	Air pollution weather	
	Atmospheric CO ₂ at surface	
	Radiation at surface	

High confidence of decrease	Medium confidence of decrease	Low confidence in direction or change	Medium confidence of increase	High confidence of increase
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Table 8.1: Reproduction of column 1 of Table 12.12, IPCC AR6 Working Group I report. Emergence of anthropogenic signal in historical period for CIDs shown. White: no signal detected. Blue and orange: change detected (decrease or increase) and confidence level as indicated in color legend.

As discussed in Chapter 7 natural variability dominates patterns of extreme weather systems and simplistic assertions of trend detection are frequently undermined by regional heterogeneity and trend reversals over time. Table 8.1 makes the related point that, again contrary to popular belief, attribution of changes in most extreme weather types to human influence is not currently possible. Taking wind as an example, the IPCC claims that an anthropogenic signal has not emerged in average wind speeds, severe windstorms, tropical cyclones or sand and dust storms, nor is one expected to emerge this century even under an extreme emissions scenario. The same applies to drought and fire weather.

8.6 Extreme event attribution (EEA)

Examining the IPCC's treatment of extreme weather and climate event attribution more broadly, the AR6 provides an ambiguous assessment of the role of anthropogenic warming that differs between chapters. Chapter 11 of WG1 states (Seneviratne et al., 2021):

Evidence of observed changes in extremes and their attribution to human influence (including greenhouse gas and aerosol emissions and land-use changes) has strengthened since AR5, in particular for extreme precipitation, droughts, tropical cyclones and compound extremes (including dry/hot events and fire weather). Some recent hot extreme events would have been extremely unlikely to occur without human influence on the climate system.

By contrast, as noted above, Chapter 12 of WG1 (Table 12.12) paints a different picture – presumably, the expert judgment of different groups of authors for the two chapters came to different conclusions (Ranasinghe, 2021):

- High confidence in an increase in extreme heat events in tropical regions where observations allow trend estimation and in most regions in the mid-latitudes, medium confidence elsewhere
- Medium confidence in a decrease in extreme cold events in Australia, Africa and most of northern South America where observations allow trend estimation
- No evidence of emergence in the historical period of a change in river floods, heavy precipitation, drought, fire weather, severe wind storms, and tropical cyclones

While the overall issue of detecting changes in extreme weather events and their attribution remains ambiguous, most of the activity in this area relates to the attribution of particular extreme weather events. The most prominent effort is World Weather Attribution (WWA; worldweatherattribution.org), an international research initiative for extreme event attribution that purports to analyze how climate change influences the likelihood and intensity of extreme weather events. Their approach is to use large ensembles of regional climate models to compare the event in today's climate with a counterfactual pre-industrial climate without human influences.

WWA has a prominent public presence in linking extreme weather to climate change, with its press releases attracting considerable attention in public and policy discussions. However, the WWA's extensive promotion of non-peer-reviewed findings, its funding ties, its open admission to shaping analyses to serve litigation, and its methodological challenges have sparked controversies, with critics questioning the robustness and impartiality of their conclusions (Pielke Jr. 2024). Despite these issues, WWA's work continues to influence climate science and media narratives. Technical criticisms of the approach include a lack of a formal detection process; an implicit assumption that 100% of the post-industrial warming is caused by greenhouse gases; and a failure to adequately account for internal climate variability.

Because EEA is relatively new many basic methodological issues have yet to be settled in the expert literature. An important challenge is the lack of data. Extreme events are by definition rare. Many analyses of extreme event types (including the US National Assessment Reports) only evaluate data since 1950 or 1970. However, as emphasized by Chapter 7, many of the worst extreme weather and climate events in U.S. history occurred prior to the first half of the 20th century including in the early 19th century. And if paleoclimate reconstructions are considered, it becomes very difficult for an event to pass the detection thresholds of exceeding what is expected from natural variability, particularly if a reasonably sized geographic region is considered.

Another challenge is defining the event under study. There is a longstanding literature in statistics and econometrics on the challenge of analyzing data with outliers. The issue arises because a data series establishes a probability distribution defining the expected range of observations. If an outlier is observed it might indicate that the underlying process giving rise to the data distribution has changed (which in the weather context would mean that a climate change has been detected) or that the underlying process has multiple regimes each with a different probability distribution, in which case observing an outlier simply means we were temporarily in a different regime, but the system itself was unchanged. If a time series contains only a single outlier event at the end of the series it is not possible to determine which model is the correct one (Chen and Liu 1993). For instance, there might be an “ordinary” weather regime that yields a distribution of summer daytime highs in a particular coastal region, and a second “heatwave” regime that kicks in when an inland blocking event occurs, which yields a temperature distribution centered 15°C higher than the first one. A day with temperatures 13°C above normal would either be an extreme heat anomaly under the first regime or a somewhat cool event under the second, and we have no way in this case of knowing on statistical grounds which view is correct.

Visser and Petersen (2012) and Sardeshmukh et al. (2015) both point out that different distributions may fit observed data equally well but yield very different implications about the likelihood of a specific weather event. Visser and Petersen argue that, in view of the deep uncertainties of extreme weather analysis drawing a connection between individual events and global climate change should be avoided. Furthermore, the existence of an outlier at the end of a data series poses the problem that estimates of the event probabilities will be biased whether the outlier is included or excluded (Barlow et al., 2020). Methods to eliminate the bias have not yet been established, leading some experts (e.g. Miralles and Davison 2023) to argue that in settings in which a data series contains a single extreme event at the end, estimation of a return period for the extreme event will be so biased and uncertain it should be avoided altogether.

In spite of these concerns, the U.S. is presently considering something like the WWA, which is being investigated by a NASEM Panel on Attribution of Extreme Weather and Climate Events and their impacts (NASEM, 2025).

We provide a case study of a recent high impact extreme event in the U.S. to illustrate the challenges and ambiguities in attributing the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events to human-caused warming.

8.6.1 Case study – 2021 Western North America heat wave

The 2021 Western North America heat wave was an extreme event that affected much of Western North America in late June 2021. In particular, surface temperature records were set in Portland, OR (116°F; previous record 107°F) and Seattle, WA (108 °F; previous record 103°F) (Mass et al., 2024).

The WWA team generated international headlines with their analysis, which provided the following attribution statements (WWA, 2021; Philip et al., 2022):

- Based on observations and modeling, the occurrence of this heatwave was virtually impossible without human-caused climate change.
- The event is estimated to be about a 1 in 1000-year event in today’s climate.

- The event would have been at least 150 times rarer without human-induced climate change.
- This heatwave was about 2°C hotter than it would have been if it had occurred at the beginning of the industrial revolution (when global mean temperatures were 1.2°C cooler than today).

But an important counter to the first claim is that other researchers concluded from historical weather data that while a heat wave of the magnitude observed was indeed virtually impossible without anthropogenic climate change, it was also virtually impossible *with* climate change. Bercos-Hickey (2022) noted “these temperatures were virtually impossible under any previously experienced meteorological conditions, with or without global warming.” McKinnon and Simpson (2022) stated “the most likely explanation remains that the weather event itself was ‘bad luck.’” The 2023 Oregon Climate Assessment (Fleischman, 2023) concluded that the heat dome would have formed even without climate change and “There is no evidence that the highly unusual combination of weather features that drove the heat dome were made more likely by climate change, and climate models do not project an increase in the frequency of high-pressure ridges over the Pacific Northwest” (Fleischman, 2023, p. 49).

Mass et al. (2024) summarizes the proximate sequence of compound events leading to the heat wave. There was a record-breaking mid-tropospheric ridge over the Pacific Northwest, forced by a tropical disturbance in the western Pacific. This produced record-breaking mid-tropospheric temperatures, strong subsidence in the lower atmosphere, low-level easterly flow that produced downslope warming on regional terrain and the removal of cooler marine air, and an approaching low-level trough that enhanced downslope flow. The event occurred at a time of maximum solar insolation, and drier-than-normal soil moisture. Using a storyline approach, Mass et al. assessed that there is no trend in drought and dry soils in the Pacific Northwest; there is no evidence of global warming producing stronger ridges of high pressure, and no observed trend in heat waves or record temperatures in the region. They concluded that although anthropogenic warming may have contributed as much as 2°F to the magnitude of the event, there is little evidence of further amplification of the event from increasing greenhouse gases.

Bercos-Hickey et al. (2022) conducted a statistical analysis of a model-based attribution study of this heat wave. Because the event is a far outlier and far above the bounds of Generalized Extreme Value distributions fitted from historical data, they concluded that estimates of return times, quantitative changes in event magnitude and frequency, and probability of the extreme temperatures such as provided by the WWA are not accurate and should be interpreted as having low confidence. They found that hindcast attribution methods using an ensemble of regional climate models, combined with Pearl (2009) causal inferences, can provide limited and conditional information about the magnitude of the human influence on this heatwave - they provided a more highly constrained estimate that human activities caused a ~1.4°C–1.8°F increase in the daily maximum temperatures.

Zeder et al. (2023) also concluded that the methods employed by Philip et al. (2022, the WWA analysis) tend to overstate the rarity of extreme heat waves, leading to a biased perception of the effect of climate change on the heatwave event: “The tendency to overestimate the return period of observed extreme heatwave events may fuel the impression that seemingly impossible heatwave extremes are currently clustering at an unprecedented rate.”

The 2021 Western North America heatwave was a rare and unprecedented compound weather event that broke century-old temperature records by as much as 9°F. While the WWA team received worldwide publicity for their rapid attribution claims blaming anthropogenic climate change, subsequent peer-reviewed analyses showed that the event was caused by rare meteorological conditions that were not made more probable by global warming.

References

- Allen, M. R., & Tett, S. F. B. (1999). Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics*, 15(6), 419–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003820050291>
- AR4: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- AR5: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fifth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- AR6: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- Arthun, M, RCJ Willis, HL Johnson, L Chafik, HR Langehaug (2021) Mechanisms of Decadal North Atlantic Climate Variability and Implications for the Recent Cold Anomaly. *Journal of Climate*, Vol 34
- Balcombe, Kevin, Iain Fraser and Abhijit Sharma (2019) Is radiative forcing cointegrated with temperature? A further examination using a structural time series approach.” *Management of Environmental Quality* 30(5) DOI 10.1108/MEQ-12-2018-021.
- Barlow, Anna Maria, Chris Sherlock and Jonathan Tawn (2020) Inference for Extreme Values Under Threshold-Based Stopping Rules. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C* August 2020, Pages 765–789, <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssc.12420>
- Bednarz, EW, AH Butler, X Wang, Z Zhou, W Yu, G Stenchikov, M Toohey, Y Zhu (2025) Indirect climate impacts of the Hunga eruption. Preprint, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-1970>
- Bercos-Hickey, E., et al. (2022). Anthropogenic contributions to the 2021 Pacific Northwest heatwave. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49(23), e2022GL099396. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099396>
- Bokuchava, DD and VV Semenov (2021) Mechanisms of the early 20th century warming in the Arctic. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 222, 103820
- Chatzistergos, T., Krivova, N. A., & Yeo, K. L. (2023). Long-term changes in solar activity and irradiance. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 252, 106150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2023.106150>
- Chen, C., & Liu, L.-M. (1993). Joint estimation of model parameters and outlier effects in time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88(421), 284–297. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2290724>
- Chen, L., J.J. Dolado, J. Gonzalo and A. Ramos (2023) Heterogeneous predictive association of CO2 with global warming. *Economica* 2023 90:1397–1421 DOI: 10.1111/ecca.12491
- Chylek, P., et al. (2016). The role of Atlantic Multi-Decadal Oscillation in the global mean temperature variability. *Climate Dynamics*, 47(9–10), 3271–3279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3025-7>
- Connolly, R., et al. (2021). How much has the sun influenced Northern Hemisphere temperature trends? An ongoing debate. *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 21(6), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131>
- Cramer, W., et al. (2014). Detection and attribution of observed impacts. In C. B. Field et al. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects* (pp. 979–1037). Cambridge University Press.
- Dagsvik, JK SH Moen (2023) To what extent are temperature levels changing due to greenhouse gas emissions? Statistics Norway Discussion Paper 1007 September 2023
- Dagsvik, JK, M Fortuna and SH Moen (2020) How Does Temperature Vary Over Time?: Evidence on the Stationary and Fractal Nature of Temperature Fluctuations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, Volume 183, Issue 3, June 2020, Pages 883–908, <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12557>

- Davidson, James E.H., David B. Stephenson and Alemtsehai A. Turasie (2015) Time series modeling of paleoclimate data *Environmetrics* 27(1) <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/env.2373>
- Dergiades, T., R.K. Kaufmann and T. Panagiotidis (2016). Long-run changes in radiative forcing and surface temperature: The effect of human activity over the last five centuries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 76:67—85. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0095069615000911>
- England, Mark, Lorenzo M Polvani, James A Screen, et al (2025). Surprising, but not unexpected, multi-decadal pause in Arctic sea ice loss. *ESS Open Archive*. March 29, 2025.
- Fleishman, E., editor. (2023). Sixth Oregon Climate Assessment. Oregon Climate Change Research Institute, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. <https://blogs.oregonstate.edu/occric/oregon-climate-assessments>
- Frajka-Williams, E, C Beaulieu, Aurelie Duchez (2017) Emerging negative Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation index in spite of warm subtropics. *Scientific Reports*, 7:11224
- Goessling, Helge F. Thomas Rackow and Thomas Jung (2024) Recent global temperature surge intensified by record-low planetary albedo. *Science* Vol 387, Issue 6729 pp. 68-73 <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.adq7280>
- Gulev, S. K., et al. (2021). Changing state of the climate system. In V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 287–422). Geneva: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Hansen J and P Karecha (2025) Large cloud feedback confirms high sensitivity.
- Hegerl, G. C., et al. (2007). Understanding and attributing climate change. In S. Solomon et al. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 663–745). Cambridge University Press.
- Hegerl, GC, S Bronniman, A Schurer et al. (2017) Early 20th century warming: Anomalies, causes and consequences. *WIREs Climate Change*, DOI: 10.1002/wcc.522
- Hegerl, GC, S Bronniman, T Cowan (2019) Causes of climate change over the historical record. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14, 123006
- Hodnebrog, Ø et al. (2024), Recent reductions in aerosol emissions have increased Earth’s energy imbalance. *Communications Earth and Environment* 5, 166 (2024). doi:10.1038/s43247-024-01324-8
- Houghton, J. T., et al. (Eds.). (2001). *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 1–881). Cambridge University Press. <https://mailchi.mp/caa/large-cloud-feedback-confirms-high-climate-sensitivity>
- Kravtsov, S., Westgate, A., & Gavrilov, A. (2024). Global-scale multidecadal variability in climate models and observations, part II: The stadium wave. *Climate Dynamics*, 62, 10281–10306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-024-07451-4>
- Kuchar, A., Sukhodolov, T., Chiodo, G., Jörmann, A., Kult-Herdin, J., Rozanov, E., and Rieder, H. H. (2025): Modulation of the northern polar vortex by the Hunga Tonga–Hunga Ha’apai eruption and the associated surface response, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 25, 3623–3634, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-3623-2025>.
- Lewis, Nicholas (2023) “Objectively Combining Climate Sensitivity Evidence,” *Climate Dynamics* 61, no. 9–10 (2023): 3155–3163, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06398-8>.

- Lockwood, M. (2012). Solar influence on global and regional climates. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 33(3–4), 503–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-012-9181-3>
- Loeb, N. G. et al. (2019) Decomposing Shortwave Top-of-Atmosphere and Surface Radiative Flux Variations in Terms of Surface and Atmospheric Contributions. *Journal of Climate* 32(16), 5003–5019 (2019). doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0826.1
- Loeb, N., S-H Ham, RP Allen, TJ Thorsen, B Meyssignac, S Kato, GC Johnson, JL Lyman (2024) Observational Assessment of Changes in Earth’s Energy Budget since 2000. *Surveys in Geophysics*, 45, 1757–1783
- Mass, C., et al. (2024). The Pacific Northwest heat wave of 25–30 June 2021: Synoptic/mesoscale conditions and climate perspective. *Weather and Forecasting*, 39(2), 275–291. <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-23-0154.1>
- Matthes, K., et al. (2017). Solar forcing for CMIP6 (v3.2). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10(6), 2247–2302. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2247-2017>
- McKinnon, K. and I. Simpson (2022) How Unexpected Was the 2021 Pacific Northwest Heatwave? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL100380. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL100380>
- McKinnon, K. and I. Simpson (2022) How Unexpected Was the 2021 Pacific Northwest Heatwave? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL100380. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL100380>
- McKittrick, R. (2021). Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting: A comment. *Climate Dynamics*, 58(1–2), 405–411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05913-7>
- McKittrick, R. (2023). Total least squares bias in climate fingerprinting regressions with heterogeneous noise variances and correlated explanatory variables. *Environmetrics*, 35(2), e2835. <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2835>
- McKittrick, Ross R (2022) On the choice of TLS versus OLS in climate signal detection regression. *Climate Dynamics* 10.1007/s00382-022-06315-z
- McKittrick, Ross R (2025) Consistent Climate Fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics* forthcoming preprint available at www.rossmckittrick.com
- McLean, J.D., C. R. de Freitas, and R. M. Carter, (2009) “Influence of the Southern Oscillation on Tropospheric Temperature,” *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 114, no. D14 (July 23, 2009): D14104, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011637>.
- Miralles, O., & Davison, A. (2023). Timing and spatial selection bias in rapid extreme event attribution. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 41, 100...
- Miralles, Ophélie and Anthony Davison (2023) Timing and spatial selection bias in rapid extreme event attribution. *Weather and Climate Extremes* 41 100584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2023.100584>
- Myhre, G., D. Shindell, F.-M. Bréon, et al (2013): Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing. In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (NASEM, Forthcoming). Attribution of extreme weather and climate events and their impacts. The National Academies Press. <https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/attribution-of-extreme-weather-and-climate-events-and-their-impacts>
- Nissan, Hannah, Lisa Goddard, Erin Coughlan de Perez, et al. (2019) On the use and misuse of climate change projections in international development. *Wires Climate Change* 14 March 2019 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.579>

- Palmer, Tim N and Bjorn Stevens (2019) The scientific challenge of understanding and estimating climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116 (49) 24390-24395
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906691116>
- Pearl, J. (2009). Causality. Cambridge University Press.
- Philip, S. Y., et al. (2022). Rapid attribution analysis of the extraordinary heatwave on the Pacific coast of the US and Canada June 2021. *Earth System Dynamics*, 13(4), 1689–1713.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-13-1689-2022>
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2024) Weather Attribution Alchemy. Substack essay
<https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/weather-attribution-alchemy>
- Ranasinghe, R., Ruane, A. C., Vautard, R., Arnell, N., Coppola, E., Cruz, F. A., ... Zaaboul, R. (2021). Chapter 12: Climate change information for regional impact and for risk assessment. In V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (pp. 1767–1926). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.014>
- Razzak, Weshah A. (2022). "The Econometrics of Global Warming," *Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, vol. 65(2), pages 13-47.
- Sardeshmukh, P. D., Compo, G. P., & Penland, C. (2015). Need for caution in interpreting extreme weather statistics. *Journal of Climate*, 28(23), 9166–9187. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0020.1>
- Scafetta, N. (2013). Discussion on climate oscillations: CMIP5 general circulation models versus a semi-empirical harmonic model based on astronomical cycles. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 126, 321
- Scaffeta, Nicola (2021) “Reconstruction of the Interannual to Millennial Scale Patterns of the Global Surface Temperature,” *Atmosphere* 12, no. 2: 147, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12020147>
- Schmidt, G. (2024) Climate models can’t explain 2023’s huge heat anomaly — we could be in uncharted territory. *Nature* 627, 467. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-024-00816-z>
- Schmutz, Werner K. (2021) “Changes in the Total Solar Irradiance and Climatic Effects,” *Journal of Space Weather and Space Climate* 11: 40, <https://doi.org/10.1051/swsc/2021016>.
- Seneviratne, S. et al. (2021) “Chapter 11: Weather and Climate Extreme Events in a Changing Climate.” In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, et al., 1513–1766. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.013>.
- Solanki, S.K. et al. (2004), “Unusual Activity of the Sun during Recent Decades Compared to the Previous 11,000 Years,” *Nature* 431, no. 7012 (October 28, 2004): 1084–1087,
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02995>.
- Stefani, Frank (2021) “Solar and Anthropogenic Influences on Climate: Regression Analysis and Tentative Predictions,” *Climate* 9, no. 11 (November 3, 2021): 163,
<https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9110163>.
- Thompson, DJW, JM Wallace, JJ Kennedy, PD Jones (2010) An abrupt drop in Northern Hemisphere Sea Surface Temperature around 1970. *Nature*, 467, 444-447
- Tokinaga, H, SP Xie, and H Mukougawa (2017) Early 20th century Arctic warming intensified by Pacific and Atlantic multidecadal variability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114, 6227-6233 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1615880114>

- Tung, Ka-Kit and Jiansong Zhou (2013) “Using Data to Attribute Episodes of Warming and Cooling in Instrumental Records,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, no. 6 (January 23, 2013): 2058–2063, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212471110>.
- Usoskin, I.G., S. K. Solanki, and G. A. Kovaltsov (2007) “Grand Minima and Maxima of Solar Activity: New Observational Constraints,” *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 471, no. 1 (June 6, 2007): 301–309, <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20077704>.
- Velasco Herrera, V.M., B. Mendoza, and G. Velasco Herrera (2015) “Reconstruction and Prediction of the Total Solar Irradiance: From the Medieval Warm Period to the 21st Century,” *New Astronomy* 34 (January 2015): 221–233, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2014.07.009>.
- Visser, H. and A.C. Petersen (2012) Inferences on weather extremes and weather-related disasters: a review of statistical methods *Climates of the Past* 8, 265–286
<https://cp.copernicus.org/articles/8/265/2012/cp-8-265-2012.pdf>
- World Weather Attribution (2021) “Western North American Extreme Heat Virtually Impossible without Human-Caused Climate Change.” July 7, 2021. <https://www.worldweatherattribution.org/western-north-american-extreme-heat-virtually-impossible-without-human-caused-climate-change/>.
- Yuan, et al. (2024) Abrupt reduction in shipping emission as an inadvertent geoengineering termination shock produces substantial radiative warming. *Communications Earth and Environment* 5, 281 (2024). doi:10.1038/s43247-024-01442-3
- Zeder, J., Sippel, S., Pasche, O. C., Engelke, S., & Fischer, E. M. (2023). The effect of a short observational record on the statistics of temperature extremes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL104090. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL104090>

PART III: IMPACTS ON ECOSYSTEMS AND SOCIETY

9 CLIMATE CHANGE AND US AGRICULTURE

Chapter summary

There is abundant evidence going back decades that rising CO₂ levels benefit plants, including agricultural crops, and that CO₂-induced warming will be a net benefit to US agriculture. The warming since 1981, in combination with adaptive behavior by farmers, has been beneficial for maize. The increased ambient CO₂ has also boosted productivity of all major US crop types. Various attempts to argue that CO₂-induced warming will harm agriculture do not hold up under scrutiny.

9.1 Econometric analyses

Econometric analyses of the effects of climate change on agriculture have sought to integrate information about long term crop yield changes in response to temperature and precipitation changes under assumptions about adaptive behavior by farmers. One method focuses on variations in agricultural land values. The rationale is that if climate change is a long-term net benefit for agriculture it should be capitalized into higher market values for agricultural land, and vice versa. While individual crops might benefit from or be harmed by climate change, once the adaptive responses of farmers are considered the value of farmland represents an index of whether the changes are expected to be beneficial or not. Mendelsohn et al. (1994) examined the relationship between historical climatic variations on agricultural land values and concluded global warming would be slightly beneficial to American agriculture.

The Mendelsohn et al. method, called Ricardian analysis after David Ricardo, the 19th century British economist who pioneered the study of land values, attracted subsequent criticism from authors who argued it failed to account for differences in land values attributable to fixed locational characteristics like soil quality, and non-climatic changes including nearby urbanization. Deschênes and Greenstone (2007) looked at agricultural profits instead of land values and reached conclusions similar to Mendelsohn et al. (1994), namely that past climatic variations had relatively little effect on farm profitability and that warming would likely yield small overall benefits for the US agricultural sector. However, a subsequent exchange with critics led them (Deschênes and Greenstone 2012) to revise their conclusions and project potentially large losses in US agriculture due to climate warming.

Burke and Emerick (2016) looked at temperature variations over 1980 to 2000 and argued that farmers were not as able to adapt to temperature changes as the Ricardian method assumes and that climate change would have large negative impacts on corn and soy yields. Schlenker and Roberts (2009) similarly argued that yield gains to past warming would not carry over to the future and corn and soy yields would sharply decrease this century due to climate change.

Two recent studies have argued that pessimistic findings such as these are not robust. Ortiz-Bobea (2019) argued that land values aggregate farm and non-farm influences and the latter need to be filtered out. He developed a data set using cash rents for agricultural activity as a measure of land value specifically for farming activity. Whereas the land value model implied future losses under climate warming, the same model estimated using cash rents did not, leading the author to conclude the pessimistic results were due to using an inaccurate measure of the returns to farming activity. Bareille and Chakir (2023) assembled a large data base on farm sale prices in France for properties that sold twice between 1996 and 2019. They could replicate pessimistic results showing negative effects of warming on agricultural land values using conventional econometric modeling. But by taking advantage of the repeat sales data, which provides information on site-specific changes in land prices, they found the results reversed and implied that climate change will be very beneficial for French agriculture. The authors concluded that, taking adaptation into account, a warming climate would yield positive benefits for French agriculture that were between two and

20 times larger than had previously been estimated. On average, with full adaptation, they concluded that climate changes under the medium RCP4.5 scenario could double the value of French farmland by 2100.

A major deficiency of all these studies, however, is that they omit the role of CO₂ fertilization. Climate change as it relates to this report is caused by GHG emissions, chiefly CO₂. The econometric analyses referenced above focus only on temperature and precipitation changes and do not take account of the beneficial growth effect of the additional CO₂ that drives them. As explained in Chapter 2 CO₂ is a major driver of plant growth, so this omission biases the analysis towards underestimation of the benefits of climate change to agriculture.

9.2 Field studies of CO₂ enrichment

One of the ways the effect of CO₂ on crop growth has been studied is through “free air enrichment experiment” or FACE plots, in which small sources of CO₂ are placed in fields surrounding plants and the growth response to elevated CO₂ under varying weather conditions are recorded. Ainsworth et al. (2020) summarizes results from about 250 such studies. They found that elevation of CO₂ by 200 ppm caused an average 18% increase in crop yield in C3 plants. C4 plants exhibited benefits mainly under drought conditions.

In addition to FACE plot experiments there have been thousands of laboratory experiments on the effects of CO₂ on all kinds of plant growth. Here we review some of the results on key US agricultural crops.

Soybean

Studies on the impact of elevated CO₂ on Soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) plants in the water-deficient region of Huang-Huai-Hai Plain, China, showed that elevated CO₂ concentrations improved photosynthesis rate, water use efficiency, and growth Li (2013) under both normal conditions and drought conditions. The CO2Science.org website reports on 108 published experiments between 1985 and 2019 exposing soybean to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +50.9 percent. There were also ten studies reporting on +600 ppm CO₂ enrichment, which increased photosynthesis by an average of 90.3%.

Maize (corn)

The CO2Science.org website reports on 28 published experiments between 1983 and 2018 exposing corn (*Zea mays* L.) to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +23.7 percent. Corn also benefits from increased drought tolerance under elevated CO₂. An experimental study (Allen Jr., 2011) exposed plants to water stress conditions in sunlit controlled-environment chambers at 360 ppm (ambient) and 720 ppm (elevated) CO₂. The drought stress caused a 41% loss of growth under ambient CO₂ but only a 13% loss under elevated CO₂.

Wheat

The CO2Science.org website reports on 92 published experiments between 1983 and 2020 exposing common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +67.6 percent. Blandino (2020) measured both the yield and nutritional quality of an “improver” hybrid wheat variety and its parents under elevated CO₂ levels (+166 ppm). They reported a grain yield increase of +16% but a 7% decrease in grain protein levels. But they found that the food quality of different wheat varieties responded differently to elevated CO₂ levels, so that with proper varietal selection, growers could select wheat types that best take advantage of the elevated CO₂.

Further evidence




Figure 9.1: US average CO₂ levels and yields of corn, soy and wheat all normalized so 1940=100. Source: Taylor and Schlenker (2021)

A 2021 report from the US National Bureau of Economic Research (Taylor and Schlenker 2021) used satellite-measured observations of outdoor CO₂ levels across the United States, matched to county-level agricultural output data and other economic variables. After controlling for the effects of weather, pollution and technology the authors concluded that CO₂ emissions had boosted U.S. crop production since 1940 by 50 to 80 percent, attributing much larger gains than had previously been estimated using FACE experiments. They found that every ppm of increase in CO₂ concentration boosts corn yields by 0.5 percent, soybeans by 0.6 percent, and wheat by 0.8 percent.

Beyond growth benefits, extra CO₂ boosts plant resilience to dryness. Deryng et al. (2016) surveyed evidence on crop water productivity (CWP, the yield per unit of water used), drawing attention to the potential for CO₂ both to enhance photosynthesis and reduce leaf-level transpiration (water loss during leaf respiration). They surveyed all available FACE data on crop yield changes for Maize (corn), Wheat, Rice and Soybean, and combined it with crop model data simulating yield responses as of 2080 under the extreme RCP8.5 scenario in four growing regions (Tropics, Arid, Temperate and Cold) each of which were split into rainfed and irrigated sub-regions. In every region they reported that models without CO₂ fertilization predicted CWP losses but CO₂ fertilization more than offset them; once fertilization was taken into account, all regions showed a net CWP gain. Deryng et al also reported that negative yield impacts on wheat and soybean were fully offset by CWP gains, and mitigated by up to 90% for rice and 60% for maize.

Similar to this, Cheng et al. (2017) noted that increased global plant growth from 1982 to 2011 due to rising CO₂ uptake was accompanied by such large gains in CWP that despite the extra biomass global water use by plants had not increased.




Figure 9.2 Crop yields under CO₂-induced climate warming. Blue: as published in Moore et al. (2017). Green: after including omitted data. Source: McKittrick (2025).

Deryng et al. (2016) assumed that climate change would “exacerbate water scarcity”. It is noteworthy that while models predict drylands will expand under climate warming, observations show the opposite: greening is happening even in arid areas. Zhang et al. (2024) report that due to increased CO₂ levels “increasing aridity in drylands won’t lead to a general loss of vegetation productivity”; increased desertification will happen in at most 4% of currently arid areas.

9.3 Crop modeling meta-analyses

Notwithstanding the abundant evidence for the direct benefits of CO₂ and of CO₂-induced warming on crop growth, in 2023 the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 2023) boosted its estimate of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) about five-fold based in large part on a very pessimistic 2017 estimate of global agricultural damages from climate warming (Moore et al., 2017). One of the two damage models used by the EPA attributed nearly half of the 2030 SCC to projected global agricultural damages based on the Moore et al. (2017) analysis. This study was a meta-analysis of crop model studies simulating yield changes for agricultural crops under various climate warming scenarios. Moore et al. projected declining global crop yields for all crop types in all regions due to warming.

McKittrick (2025) re-examined the Moore et al. database and found that, while it claimed to cover 1,722 studies, only half the entries ($N=862$) had complete records, so that the sample available for regression analysis was much smaller than both studies indicated. McKittrick noted that the variable most commonly missing was the change in ambient CO_2 and found that in many cases these could be recovered from the underlying studies or the original climate scenario tables. He thereby increased the usable sample size by 40 percent. The crop yield projections incorporating the newly available data changed considerably. As shown in Figure 10.2, whereas the partial data set implied warming would decrease yield (blue lines), the complete data set implied constant or increase global yields, even out to 5°C warming (green lines).

In summary, there is abundant evidence going back decades that rising CO_2 levels benefit plants including agricultural crops, and that CO_2 -induced warming will be a net benefit to US agriculture.

References

- Ainsworth, Elizabeth and Stephen P. Long (2020) 30 years of free-air carbon dioxide enrichment (FACE): What have we learned about future crop productivity and its potential for adaptation? *Global Change Biology* <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15375>
- Allen Jr, L. K. (2011). Elevated CO_2 increases water use efficiency by sustaining photosynthesis of water-limited maize and sorghum. *Journal of Plant physiology*, 168(16), 1909-1918.
- Bareille, F. and R. Chakir (2023) The impact of climate change on agriculture: A repeat-Ricardian analysis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 119
- Blandino, M. B. (2020). Elevated CO_2 impact on common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) yield, wholemeal quality, and sanitary risk. *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 68(39), 10574-10585.
- Burke, Marshall and Kyle Emerick (2016) Adaptation to Climate Change: Evidence from US Agriculture. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 8(3) August 2016 106—140 <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pol.20130025>
- Cheng, L., Zhang, L., Wang, YP. *et al.* Recent increases in terrestrial carbon uptake at little cost to the water cycle. *Nature Communications* 8, 110 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00114-5>
- $\text{CO}_2\text{Science.org}$ (undated) Plant growth archive http://www.co2science.org/data/plant_growth/dry/dry_subject_b.php
- Deryng, D., Elliott, J., Folberth, C. *et al.* (2021) Regional disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO_2 concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nature Climate Change* 6, 786–790 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2995>
- Deschênes, Olivier and Michael Greenstone (2012) The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Output and Random Fluctuations in Weather: Reply to Comment *American Economic Review*. 102, no. 7: 3761-3773. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/82641>
- Li, D. L. (2013). Effects of elevated CO_2 on the growth, seed yield, and water use efficiency of soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) under drought stress. *Agricultural Water Management*, 129, 105-112.
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended Crop Yield Meta-analysis Data do not Support Upward SCC Revision. *Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>
- Mendelsohn, R., Nordhaus, W. D., & Shaw, D. (1994). The impact of global warming on agriculture: a Ricardian analysis. *The American Economic Review*, Sept 1994 753-771.
- Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>
- Ortiz-Bobea, Ariel (2019) The role of nonfarm influences in ricardian estimates of climate change impacts on US agriculture. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 102 (3), 934–959.

- Schlenker, Wolfram and Michael Roberts (2009) Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe damages to U.S. crop yields under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (37) 15594-15598 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0906865106>
- Taylor, Charles and Wolfram Schlenker (2023) Environmental drivers of agricultural productivity growth: CO2 fertilization of US field crops. National Bureau of Economic Research Working paper 29320, <http://www.nber.org/paper/w29320>
- US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, “Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review”, EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf
- Zhang et al. (2024) Less than 4% of dryland areas are projected to desertify despite increased aridity under climate change. *Nature Communications Earth and Environment* 5 June 2024 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01463-y>

10 MANAGING RISKS OF EXTREME WEATHER

Chapter summary

Trends in losses from extreme weather and climate events are dominated by population increases and economic growth. Technological advances such as improved weather forecasting and early warning systems have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Better building codes, flood defenses, and disaster response mechanisms have lowered economic losses relative to GDP. The US economy's expansion has diluted the relative impact of disaster costs, as seen in the comparison of historical and modern GDP percentages. Heat-related mortality risk has dropped substantially due to adaptive measures including the adoption of air conditioning, which relies on the availability of affordable energy. U.S. mortality risks even under extreme warming scenarios are not projected to increase as long as people are able to undertake adaptive responses.

10.1 Socioeconomic context

Risks from human-caused climate change are affected by natural weather and climate variability, and are dominated by the exposure of wealth in coastal and other disaster-prone regions and vulnerabilities of poorer populations. The evolution of climate risk in the U.S. has been dominated by societal factors, rather than by changes to the actual weather and climate hazards. Deaths from weather disasters have decreased substantially since 1900, even as US population grew from 76 million in 1900 to over 331 million in 2020 (Goklany 2011). For example, the Galveston hurricane killed over 8,000 people in 1900 (0.01% of the US population), whereas the worst recent disaster, Hurricane Katrina in 2005, killed 1800 people (or 0.0006% of the US population) (NOAA National Hurricane Center 2025; US Census Bureau 2025).

Technological advances have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Early warning systems, satellite monitoring, and improved weather forecasting have reduced deaths, although exact numbers are hard to quantify (Deryugina and Hsiang 2023). US weather forecasting has been estimated to reduce losses from weather events with an annualized benefit of \$31.5B, protecting lives, property, and supporting agriculture and transportation (NRC 2010). Improved hurricane forecasts have reduced pre- and post-landfall spending, with annual per hurricane cost reductions estimated at \$5B (NBER 2024).

Infrastructure improvements have contributed to substantial reductions in losses from extreme weather events. Building codes, such as those implemented in Florida after Hurricane Andrew (1992) have reduced losses by ensuring structures can withstand high winds and floods. Homes built after 2002 showed minimal damage during Hurricane Michael (2018), unlike older homes (FEMA 2020). Sea walls, like the Galveston Seawall, protect against wave action and storm surge. The New Orleans Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System successfully mitigated storm surge during Hurricane Isaac (2012) (Battelle Memorial Institute 2013). Inland dams in the US help control flooding by storing excess water during heavy rains. It is estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) dams prevent about \$309M in annual flood damage in the TVA region and along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers (TVA, 2025). During Hurricane Helene (2024), TVA's strategies prevented approximately \$406M in potential damages (APPA 2024).




Figure 10.1: Losses per disaster in NOAA's billion dollar disaster dataset (the version downloaded in July 2023), 1980 to 2022. Source: (Pielke, Jr. 2024)

10.2 Data challenges

Since 1980, NOAA has provided a count of annual U.S. weather-related disasters that it estimates to have exceeded \$1Billion (inflation adjusted), showing a substantial increase starting in 2008. NOAA and other government officials have cited the upward trend in the Billion Dollar Disaster series as evidence that climate change is making extreme weather worse (Pielke Jr., 2024). But over time, population and wealth have increased dramatically in the US, so when an extreme weather or climate event occurs, there is more damage even if there is no underlying trend in the frequency or intensity of extreme weather. Pielke Jr. (2024) demonstrates that losses per weather disaster as a proportion of GDP have decreased by about 80% since 1980 as shown in Figure 10.1. Pielke Jr. (2024) also argued that in addition to relying on opaque data sources and unreported adjustments, NOAA failed to normalize its Billion Dollar Disaster data series properly for changes in population exposure and wealth. In May 2025 NOAA announced it has withdrawn the Billion Dollar Disaster product from publication (Pielke Jr., 2025).

In summary, trends in losses from extreme weather and climate events are dominated by population increases and economic growth. Technological advances such as improved weather forecasting and early warning systems have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Better building codes, flood defenses, and disaster response mechanisms have lowered economic losses relative to GDP. And finally, the US economy's expansion has diluted the relative impact of disaster costs, as seen in the comparison of historical and modern GDP percentages.

10.3 Mortality from temperature extremes

10.3.1 Heat and cold risks

Changes in temperature extremes are among the most certain impacts expected in a warming world. It stands to reason that extreme heat events would likely become more frequent while extreme cold events would become less frequent. This pattern is evident in the historical period though not in the continental US (Chapter 6) and is expected to continue with further warming.




Figure 10.2. Mortality attributable to extreme and moderate cold and heat by country. Source: reproduced from Gasparini et al. (2015).

Mortality during heat extremes is typically caused by heat stroke and heat exhaustion, while mortality during cold extremes is typically caused by hypothermia and heart strain. Global mortality is substantially greater for cold conditions than for hot conditions (Zhao et al 2021, Ritchie 2024). Unlike with heat-related mortality. Cold-weather risks set in even at moderately cold conditions (Gasparini et al. 2015, Lee and Dessler 2023). A 13-country study of 74 million deaths from 1985 to 2012 estimated that, on average, 7.7% of deaths were attributable to sub-optimal temperatures, of which 7.4% were attributable to cold and only 0.4% were attributable to heat (Gasparini et al. 2015). In other words cold weather killed 18.5 times as many people as did hot weather.

Figure 10.2 shows the distribution of results from Gasparini et al. (2015) by country. For the United States the fraction of deaths attributable to temperature was 5.9%, of which 5.5% was due to cold, thus cold weather killed 14 times as many people as hot weather.

The US EPA reports that, after adjusting for seasonality, the cold-related death rate in the U.S. (<https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-cold-related-deaths>) is about twice as large as the heat-related rate (see <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-cold-related-deaths> and <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-heat-related-deaths>).

There is strong evidence that people adapt to weather risks. Lee and Dessler (2023) reported that 86% of temperature-related deaths across 40 cities in the U.S. were due to cold-related mortality, and that due to adaptation the relative risk of death declined in hot and cold cities alike as seasonal temperatures increased. Allen and Sheridan (2018) found that short, early-season cold events were 2 to 5 times deadlier than hot events, but the mortality risk of both cold and hot extremes drops to nearly zero if the events occur late in the season.

Davis et al. (2003) examined heat-related mortality in 28 U.S. cities from the 1960s to the end of the 1990s and found that heat-related mortality declined by three-quarters over the sample period. Bobb et al. (2014) examined mortality data for 106 million people in over 100 cities U.S. cities and found a 60% decline in average heat-related mortality over the period 1987—2005, from 51 per thousand deaths to 19. They furthermore found that the greatest drop was among seniors over the age of 75. In a study of 42 million deaths in 211 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006. Nordio et al. (2015) found a more than 90 percent decline in the risk of mortality from excess heat.

In the context of large declines in heat-related mortality, by reducing mortality from cold events rising temperatures are associated with a net saving of lives.

The IPCC AR6 Working Group 2 Chapter 16.2.3.5 (O'Neill et al. 2022) acknowledges that heat-related mortality risk is declining over time:

Heat-attributable mortality fractions have declined over time in most countries owing to general improvements in health care systems, increasing prevalence of residential air conditioning, and behavioral changes. These factors, which determine the susceptibility of the population to heat, have predominated over the influence of temperature change.

It is both disappointing and telling to see how the IPCC misrepresents the situation in its AR6 Synthesis report. Section A.2.5 of that document states: “In all regions increases in extreme heat events have resulted in human mortality and morbidity (*very high confidence*).” But it is silent on the larger decline of deaths during extreme cold events.

The observed decline in US heat-related mortality has been specifically attributed to adaptation. Wang et al. (2018) exploited the spatial variability of heatwave-related mortality across 209 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006. While simple correlation appeared to imply an increase in mortality risk during heatwaves, accounting for adaptation to heatwave intensity caused the effect to fall to near zero and become statistically insignificant. They used the results of their epidemiological model to project heat-related mortality out to 2050 under four RCP warming scenarios (including RCP8.5) with and without adaptive behavior. Assuming people continue to adapt to the heatwave risks in the regions in which they live Wang et al. project not only no increase in heat-related mortality but an overall decrease for the US as a whole. They conclude that

Ignoring adaptation would result in a substantial overestimate of future mortality related to heat waves... Accounting for adaptation, the overall heat-related mortality by 2050 would not change substantially over time compared to 2006.

10.3.2 Mortality risks and energy costs

A 2016 study of US long term mortality risks associated with temperature variations (Barreca et al. 2016) showed that increases in mortality across the US are associated both with cold weather and hot weather. But over time, the introduction of electricity and the adoption of central heating and air conditioning (AC) dramatically reduced both risks, especially those associated with hot weather. Prior to 1960, a day above 90°F (32°C) added 2.2 percent to the average mortality risk rate, but after 1960 the same weather added only 0.3 percent to mortality risk, an 85 percent reduction. Prior to 1960 temperatures below 39°F (4°C) added about 1 percent to mortality risk but after 1960 the same weather only added about half that amount. Adaptation through conventional household improvements dramatically reduced public vulnerability to weather extremes. The entire reduction in hot weather mortality was attributable to widespread adoption of indoor AC, which depended on the availability of reliable and affordable electricity.

The corollary of this finding is that the use of heating and cooling systems depends on energy being affordable. Doremus et al. (2022) showed that wealthy and poor households in the US adjust their energy expenditures at similar rates in response to moderate temperature swings, but not in response to extreme temperature swings. When temperatures swing to very cold levels (< 5°C) energy spending in high-income

households rises by 1.2 percent but in low-income households by only 0.5 percent. On very hot days (>30°C) electricity spending in high-income households rises by 0.5 percent but does not change at all in low-income households. The latter result is observed even in subsamples where all households have AC. The implication is that even with widespread adoption of home heating and cooling systems, inability to afford energy leaves low-income households exposed to weather extremes.

References

- Allen, M.J. and S.C. Sheridan (2018) Mortality risks during extreme temperature events (ETEs) using a distributed lag non-linear model. (2018) *International Journal of Biometeorology* 62, 57–67 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-015-1117-4>
- American Public Power Association. (APPA, 2024, March 7). TVA flood mitigation strategies prevented approximately \$406 million in potential damages. Public Power Current. <https://www.publicpower.org/periodical/article/tva-flood-mitigation-strategies-prevented-approximately-406-million-potential-damages>
- Barreca, Alan, Karen Clay, Olivier Deschenes, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S Shapiro, “Adapting to climate change: The remarkable decline in the US temperature mortality relationship over the twentieth century,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2016, 124 (1), 105–159.
- Battelle Memorial Institute. (2013, December). Final independent external peer review report: Hurricane Isaac (2012) assessment (Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District). <https://www.mvn.usace.army.mil/Portals/56/docs/PD/PeerReview/TCN13-003HurIsaacAssessIEPRFinal.pdf>
- Bobb JF, RD Peng, ML Bell and F Dominici (2014) Heat-related mortality and adaptation to heat in the United States. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 122:811–816; <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/full/10.1289/ehp.1307392>
- Davis, Robert E., Paul C. Knappenberger, Patrick J. Michaels and Wendy M. Novicoff (2003) “Changing Heat-Related Mortality in the United States” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 111(14) November 2003 pp. 1712—1718 <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/pdf/10.1289/ehp.6336>
- Deryugina, T., & Hsiang, S. M. (2023). Does the environment still matter? Daily temperature and income in the United States (NBER Working Paper No. 31361). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31361>
- Doremus, JM, I. Jacqz and S. Johnston (202), “Sweating the energy bill: Extreme weather, poor households, and the energy spending gap.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2022.102609>.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2020, February 13). The role of Florida’s building codes in Hurricane Michael recovery. <https://www.fema.gov/case-study/role-floridas-building-codes-2018-hurricane-michael>
- Goklany, I. M. (2011). Deaths from extreme weather events, 1900–2010. Reason Foundation. https://a8d50b36.delivery.rocketcdn.me/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/deaths_from_extreme_weather_1900_2010.pdf
- National Bureau of Economic Research. (NBER, 2024, September). The value of improving hurricane forecasts. NBER Digest. <https://www.nber.org/digest/202409/value-improving-hurricane-forecasts>
- National Hurricane Center. (n.d.). Costliest U.S. tropical cyclones tables updated. NOAA National Hurricane Center. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/outreach/history/>
- National Research Council. (2010). Adapting to the impacts of climate change. The National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/12888/chapter/2>

- Nordio, Francesco, Antonella Zanobetti, Elena Colicino, Itai Kloog and Joel Schwartz (2015). “Changing patterns of the temperature–mortality association by time and location in the US, and implications for climate change” *Environment International* Volume 81, pp 80-86 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.04.009>.
- O'Neill, B., et al. (2022). Key risks across sectors and regions. In AR6 Working Group II Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability (pp. 2411–2538). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. www.ipcc.ch
- Pielke Jr., R. (2024). Scientific integrity and U.S. 'billion dollar disasters'. *npj Natural Hazards*, 1, Article 12. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s44304-024-00011-0>
- Pielke Jr., R. (2025, May 8). RIP NOAA's billion dollar disasters. The Honest Broker [Substack]. <https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/rip-noaas-billion-dollar-disasters>
- Ritchie, H. (2024). How many people die from extreme temperatures, and how this could change in the future: Part one. Our World in Data. <https://ourworldindata.org/part-one-how-many-people-die-from-extreme-temperatures-and-how-could-this-change-in-the-future>
- Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). (n.d.). Flood management. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.tva.com/environment/managing-the-river/flood-management>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). Decennial census by decade. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/decade.html>
- Wang, Yan, Francesco Nordio , John Nairn , Antonella Zanobetti and Joel D. Schwartz (2018) “Accounting for adaptation and intensity in projecting heat wave-related mortality” *Environmental Research* 161 pp. 464—471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.049>
- Zhao, Q., et al. (2021). Global, regional, and national burden of mortality associated with non-optimal ambient temperatures from 2000 to 2019: A three-stage modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(7). [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(21\)00081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00081-4)

11 CLIMATE CHANGE, THE ECONOMY AND THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON

Chapter summary

Economists have long considered climate a relatively unimportant factor in economic growth, a view echoed by the IPCC itself in the AR5. Mainstream climate economics has recognized that CO₂-induced warming may have some negative economic effects but they are too small to justify aggressive abatement policy, and trying to “stop” or cap global warming even at levels well above the Paris target would be worse than doing nothing. An influential study in 2012 suggested that global warming would harm growth in poor countries but the finding has subsequently been found not to be robust. Studies that take full account of modeling uncertainties either find no evidence of a negative effect on global growth from CO₂ emissions or find poor countries as likely to benefit from it as rich countries.

Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) estimates are highly uncertain due to unknowns in future economic growth, socioeconomic pathways, discount rates, climate damages, and system responses. The SCC is not intrinsically informative as to the economic or societal impacts of climate change. It provides an index connecting large networks of assumptions about the climate and the economy to a dollar value. Some assumptions yield a high SCC and others yield a low or negative SCC (i.e. a social benefit of emissions). The evidence for or against the underlying assumptions needs to be established independently; the resulting SCC adds no additional information about the validity of those assumptions. Consideration of potential tipping points at present does not justify major revisions to SCC estimates.

11.1 Climate change and economic growth

11.1.1 Overview: climate is a relatively minor issue for a modern economy

It has long been noted that economies tend to do poorly in very cold and very hot regions, with the optimum somewhere in between (Nordhaus, 2006). Temperature-sensitive economic activity migrates, whenever possible, to where it is best suited, and society always adapts to the local climate. Based in part on these observations, in 1992 Thomas Schelling, then President of the American Economic Association, argued that any effects of climate change on US economic activity would be small relative to the many other changes that would happen.

... Manufacturing rarely depends on climate, and where temperature and humidity used to make a difference, air conditioning has intervened. When Toyota chooses among Ohio, Alabama, and Southern California for locating an automobile assembly, geographical considerations are important, but not because of climate... Finance is little affected by climate; similarly for health care, or education, or broadcasting. Transportation can be affected, but improvements in all-weather landing and take-off in the last 30 years are greater than any differences that climate makes. If the average effect is a warming, iced waterways and snow removal may decline in importance. Construction is affected, mainly by cold, and if the average effect is in the direction of warming, construction may benefit slightly.

It is really agriculture that is affected. But even if agricultural productivity declined by a third over the next half century, the per capita GNP we might have achieved by 2050 we would achieve only in 2051. ...

I conclude that in the United States, and probably Japan, Western Europe, and other developed countries, the impact on economic output will be negligible and unlikely to be noticed.

Thirty years later virtually the identical point was made by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report:

For most economic sectors, the impact of climate change will be small relative to the impacts of other drivers. Changes in population, age, income, technology, relative prices, lifestyle, regulation, governance, and many other aspects of socioeconomic development will have an impact on the supply and demand of economic goods and services that is large relative to the impact of climate change.

(Arent et al. 2014, emphasis added)

That statement is validated by experience. Since 1900, the average global surface temperature anomaly warmed 1.3°C, about as much as the IPCC predicts will occur in the next century under a moderate emissions scenario. But even as the globe warmed and the population quintupled, humanity prospered as never before. For example, global average lifespan went from thirty-two years to seventy-two years, economic activity per capita grew by a factor of seven, and the death rate from extreme weather events plummeted by a factor of fifty!

While extreme weather events are costly, in all modern economies they are becoming steadily less and less important (Formetta and Feyen, 2019). Since 1990 weather-related disaster losses have declined as a proportion of global GDP (Pielke Jr , 2018, 2020) as have mortality risks (Formetta and Feyen, 2019). While economic weather-related insurance payouts are rising, this is fully explained by the growth in the size of the economy and the value of the insured asset stock. Past increases in episodes extreme weather have not had a significant effect (positive or negative) on the market value of insurance firms (Hu and McKittrick, 2015). Nor have past extreme weather events had a significant effect on US banks' performance (Blickle et al., 2021). Figure 11.1 is illustrative:




Figure 11.1 Global weather losses as a fraction of GDP. Source: Pielke Jr. (2023)

For these reasons, economists have long been reluctant to endorse attempts to “stop” climate change or even aggressively reduce GHG emissions because the costs would not be worth it. As one critic of the economics of climate policy put it:

Mainstream climate economics takes global warming seriously, but perplexingly concludes that the optimal economic policy is to almost do nothing about it... The contrast is striking. While climate science is sending out loud-and-clear messages that fossil-fuel disinvestment must start now, letting go of coal and oil and diverting resources into renewable energy technology systems, to keep warming below the 2°C limit (IPCC 2014), mainstream climate economics claims that overly ambitious climate targets will unnecessarily hurt the economy and immediate de-carbonization is too expensive. Most climate economists thus recommend humanity to just wait-and-see.

(Storm 2017)

The mainstream economics position on the climate policy question is best represented by the findings over the past three decades from Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) of climate change policy, for which Yale economist William Nordhaus was awarded the 2018 Nobel Memorial Prize in economics. IAMs combine economic, climate, and social data into a unified framework for simulating climate damages and evaluating the optimal policy response (Resources for the Future, 2025). Nordhaus’ work has generally supported modest global climate policy, with aggressive measures largely deferred to later in the century. Nordhaus developed the so-called Dynamic Integrated Model of the Climate and Economy model, or DICE, in the early 1990s (Nordhaus, 1993) to study the interaction between climate change, climate policy, and global economic growth over long times. DICE assumes global emission control can be coordinated at no cost and asks what the optimal policy target should be. The climate component of the DICE model is based on simplified climatological modeling. The version of DICE at the time of Nordhaus’ Nobel Prize award was described in Nordhaus (2018); it had a climate sensitivity parameter of 3.1°C for CO₂ doubling, consistent with the best estimate in contemporary IPCC reports (3.0°C).

The baseline (no policy) scenario incurs only \$0.4T in global abatement costs and leads to \$134.2T (trillion dollars) in global climate damages for a total cost of \$134.6T. The climate model component of

DICE projects 4.1°C warming by 2100 relative to preindustrial temperatures. Note that this is a higher estimate of warming than many IPCC climate models.

The Optimal Policy scenario barely deviates from the business-as-usual path. It aims for +3.5°C warming, in other words we modestly scale back fossil fuel use and otherwise just live with almost all the warming. This suggests that most CO₂ emissions are less harmful than the policies that would be necessary to abate them. Trying to prevent warming causes costs quickly to outstrip the benefits. Pursuing a goal of capping warming at 2.5°C creates total costs of \$177.8T, which is \$43.2T worse than doing nothing at all. Nordhaus didn't evaluate trying to reach a Paris-type target of 1.5°C warming but it would be even worse.

A subsequent edition of DICE includes higher assumed damages from warming which, not surprisingly leads to more aggressive policy recommendations, as explained in the section below on the Social Cost of Carbon.

11.1.2 Empirical analysis of climate change and economic growth

Many other studies have used econometric methods applied to historical data, instead of IAMs, to study the potential impact of climate change on economic growth. Dell et al. (2012, herein DJO12) was an influential study that used a multi-country panel of national-level data spanning 1950 to 2005, in which they matched climate and economic data by averaging temperature from the local grid cell level up to the national level using population weights. They found that warming yields an insignificant positive effect on income growth in rich countries but a significant negative effect in poor countries. Moore and Diaz (2015) modified the DICE model to take that finding into account and concluded that it implied a dramatically higher Social Cost of Carbon due to the compounding effects of income loss over time.

A large subsequent literature has debated the robustness of the DJO12 findings. Burke et al. (2015) analyzed a global panel with temperatures averaged up to the national level and found a negative effect on growth from warming in rich and poor countries alike when the national average temperature is above 13°C. Zhao et al. (2018) used the G-Econ data set of Nordhaus (2006), which breaks economic activity down to the grid cell level, replicated DJO12-type results on the same subset of countries as used in DJO12 but then showed that on the full global sample warming increases growth in rich countries and poor countries alike, though the positive effect in the latter group is confined to where local temperatures are below about 16°C. Greßer et al. (2021) developed a regional economic data set for 1,542 sub-national regions around the world between 2005 and 2015 and found temperature had no effect on growth. Yang et al. (2023) updated the DJO12 data set and applied an estimator robust to mixed sample frequencies, finding that while temperature shocks exerted a temporary effect on income levels, they did not have a significant lasting effect on growth rates.

Newell et al. (2021) noted that there is no underlying theory to guide econometric model specification in this literature. Taking into account the arbitrary choices of which explanatory variables to include they identified over 800 possible model specifications. Using the Burke et al. (2015) data they used an estimation method that accounts for model uncertainty and found that the model form preferred by Burke et al. (2015), which implied negative effects of warming on growth even in rich countries, is explicitly excluded by the optimal model selection algorithm. Overall they could not detect a temperature effect on GDP or GDP growth, and they estimated the 95% confidence interval for the impact on global growth as of 2100 even under the exaggerated RCP8.5 warming scenario spans –86 percent to +388 percent. In other words the net effect is likely positive but too uncertain to distinguish from zero.

Barker (2023) criticized the DJO12 assumption that countries can be grouped into fixed “poor” and “rich” categories based on their incomes many decades ago. He noted that many countries were once poor but became rich over time, and if this is taken into account the original temperature effects reported by Dell et al. became small and insignificant.




Figure 11.2: Decline in US GDP per degree of warming. Source: CEA-OMB (2023)

Berg et al. (2023) argued that countries shouldn't be grouped into large Rich/Poor categories because they are too heterogeneous. They instead estimated country-specific temperature response coefficients then grouped countries with similar response coefficients into small panels. They separately estimated responses to global and idiosyncratic local temperature shocks to better identify the climate signal in weather data. Overall they found countries experiencing negative effects of warming on growth outnumbered those experiencing positive effects, but only temporarily: eventually the effects reverse such that about twice as many countries experience a net positive growth effect. They also found global (as opposed to local) temperature changes are much more likely to benefit growth in poor countries than rich ones. In a simulation to 2100 even using the extreme RCP8.5 scenario they computed the average global GDP loss would be only 1.9% compared to a scenario with no warming. That is, instead of the economy growing 400% it would grow 398%. The implication of Nordhaus' earlier analysis is that trying to prevent the warming would lead to far less than 398% growth.

To summarize, economists have long considered climate a relatively unimportant factor in economic growth, a view echoed by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report. Mainstream climate economics has recognized that CO₂-induced warming may have some negative economic effects but they are too small to justify aggressive abatement policy, and trying to “stop” or cap global warming even at levels well above the Paris target would be worse than doing nothing. An influential study in 2012 suggested that global warming would harm growth in poor countries but the finding has subsequently been found not to be robust. Studies that take full account of modeling uncertainties either find no evidence of a negative effect on global growth from CO₂ emissions or find poor countries as likely to benefit from it as rich countries.

The expectation that significant global warming would have a small impact on the U.S. economy was acknowledged quietly by the Biden Administration, even as the President was proclaiming a climate emergency. Figure 11.2, from a 2023 CEA-OMB report, shows the expected decrement in U.S. GDP as a function of temperature rise. The colored lines show the results of a dozen peer-reviewed published studies while the solid black line is their average. The figure could be summarized as “a few percent impact for a few degrees of warming”. Given that the economy's annual growth rate is expected to be 1-2 percent, the impact of a warming globe is indeed negligible.

11.2 Models of the Social Cost of Carbon

The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is a tool for quantifying the economic impact of carbon dioxide emissions, helping policymakers weigh the costs and benefits of climate policies. It estimates the damage caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂, expressed in dollars. More formally, the SCC is the discounted present value of the current and future marginal loss of economic welfare due to an additional ton of CO₂ entering the atmosphere.

11.2.1 *Estimating the SCC*

Although the literature refers to “estimates” of the SCC, it is not estimated in the way other economic statistics are estimated. For instance, data on market transactions including prices and quantities can be used to estimate the current inflation rate or the growth rate of per capita real Gross Domestic Product, and there are well-understood uncertainties associated with these quantities. But there are no market data available to measure many if not most of the marginal damages or benefits believed to be associated with CO₂ emissions, so these need to be imputed using economic models.

For example, an influential component of some SCC calculations is the perceived social cost associated with changed risk of future mortality due to extreme weather. There is no market in which people can directly attach a price to that risk. At best economists can try to infer such values by looking at transactions in related markets such as real estate or insurance, but isolating the component of price changes attributable to atmospheric CO₂ levels is very difficult.

Economists use IAMs to compute the SCC. Two of the best known are the Climate Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation and Distribution (“FUND”, Tol 1997) and Nordaus’ DICE. IAMs embed a “damage function” or set of functions relating ambient temperature to local economic conditions. The assumptions embedded in the damage function will largely determine the resulting SCC. IAMs also assume a long-term discount rate or, as in DICE, compute the optimal internal discount rate as part of the solution.

One approach to developing a damage function is to begin with estimates of the costs (or benefits) of warming in specific sectors in countries around the world and aggregate up to a global amount. This was the approach used in FUND. An alternative approach is to develop a simple equation that penalizes global income according to a simple quadratic function of the average global temperature. This approach was used in DICE. In the case of the FUND model many hundreds of parameters had to be selected, whereas in DICE only three were needed and were originally chosen to assign a predetermined penalty (1.2%) to global output as of 3°C warming, with a quadratic term implying that damages grow with the square of the global average temperature anomaly. Barrage and Nordhaus (2024) recently changed the parameters to increase the penalty at 3°C to 1.6%, and added a discrete additional 1.0% GDP penalty at 3°C warming to account for “tipping points” (discrete large-scale environmental changes triggered by crossing a warming threshold) and a “judgmental adjustment” of 0.5% for excluded impacts at 3°C warming. Not surprisingly the newer version of DICE generates much higher SCC estimates than before.

The concepts of estimation and uncertainty do not readily apply to SCC calculations. By comparison, the question of whether precipitation has trended up or down along the South Carolina coast for the past hundred years can be addressed by collecting rainfall data, estimating a trend parameter and calculating statistical confidence intervals using methods with well-understood mathematical properties. In this way uncertainty can, in principle, be resolved by collecting more data and applying more accurate methods. But no amount of data collection can change the fact that many components of the SCC are unknown and rely on judgment and opinion based on knowledge of the underlying literature on the physical effects of climate change.

SCC calculations are thus best thought of as “if-then” statements: *if* the following assumptions hold, *then* the SCC is \$X per tonne. The list of ‘if’ statements includes the premise that the world’s climate and economy work according to the representation in the IAM. One way this may fail to hold is in the timing of warming. Every IAM assumes a value of the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS), which controls the amount of warming that results from CO₂ emissions and can be freely varied for the purpose of generating a distribution of SCC values associated with uncertainties over ECS. But as Roe and Baumann (2013) pointed out, time-to-equilibrium increases with the square of ECS, so an upward adjustment of the ECS parameter without an appropriate slowing down of the adjustment process can yield distorted present value damage estimates. In particular, the upper tail of warming associated with some commonly-used ECS distributions is physically impossible for even a thousand years into the future (Roe and Baumann 2013) yet in an IAM would be realized within a couple of centuries. Failure to align ECS with time-to-equilibrium will lead to an overestimate of the SCC value.

11.2.2 Variations in the SCC

Every level of the IAM calculation includes assumptions, some more influential than others. Key assumptions include the following.

- The discount rate: Climate damages accrue over a long time horizon, and costs a century or two in the future need to be discounted to the present. The higher the discount rate the smaller the present value of future damages and vice versa. The discount rate represents the opportunity cost of spending money today rather than investing it and then having more to spend tomorrow. Some economists have argued for the use of very low discount rates in SCC calculations, resulting in policy recommendations that favor relatively large immediate investments in CO₂ emission reductions. The downside is that other investments could potentially earn a larger rate of return for society.
- Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity: IAMs have customarily employed a value of 3.0°C or 3.1°C following the IPCC’s guidance. Empirically-estimated ECS values tend to be lower than this (see Chapter 9). Dayaratna et al. (2017, 2020, 2023) have shown that use of lower empirically-derived ECS values dramatically lower the resulting SCC estimate, even when low discount rates are used.
- Damage function coefficients: IAMs assume CO₂ and warming cause net harms that increase exponentially with temperature. More recently, IAMs have also incorporated effects from assumed potential climate tipping points. The FUND model took limited but explicit account of CO₂ fertilization effects in agriculture. Since the coefficients were selected prior the publication of the current evidence of global greening and the magnitude of benefits to crops from elevated CO₂ (see Chapters 2 and 10) the growth effects are likely understated. The DICE model (and others) did not explicitly include any CO₂ fertilization benefit, except to the extent it was taken into account in the literature consulted when picking the damage function coefficients. The damage function in FUND contains a region in which low warming yields net benefits in many regions, a finding which is supported by econometric models of warming and growth (Berg et al. 2023) and econometric simulations of agricultural changes (McKittrick 2025). The DICE damage function, by construction, rules out net benefits at any warming level.
- Emission scenarios: IAMs generate SCC estimates that increase as the pre-existing concentration of CO₂ increases. Consequently the value of damages later in the century will be higher, depending on the assumed baseline emissions over the coming decades.
- Abatement costs: IAMs represent the cost to the economy of reducing CO₂ emissions. If CO₂ emission reductions are assumed to be inexpensive, then the model will conclude that the optimal policy should aim for deeper emission cuts and vice versa.

It is informative to ascertain whether SCC results are invariant to changes in some assumptions. But when different assumptions result in higher or lower SCC values, the change in the SCC value does not provide *prima facie* evidence about the validity of the assumptions. For example, in 2023 the US Environmental Protection Agency raised its preferred SCC value about 5-fold over the estimates it had issued ten years earlier. This is not because new data had been collected or better mathematical methods had been invented, but because new assumptions had been used, and the validity of those assumptions was a separate question. One was that global agricultural damages were far higher than previously assumed, based on an analysis in Moore et al. (2017). But as discussed in Chapter 10, McKittrick (2025) showed that Moore et al. (2017) had used a database in which half the CO₂ change observations were missing. When as many of those observations as possible were recovered from underlying sources and the analysis was rerun, the projected crop yield losses disappeared and turned into gains at all warming levels. Hence the portion of the EPA’s SCC revision attributable to agricultural yield losses was unwarranted.

11.2.3 Evidence for low SCC

Chapter 2 reviewed evidence on climate change and greening, and Chapter 10 looked at climate change and US agriculture. Evidence shows that CO₂ fertilization has a stronger beneficial effect on agriculture than was known at the time that IAMs like DICE and FUND were parameterized. In particular Haverd et al. (2020) found the observed CO₂ fertilization rate has been almost double what had been predicted by crop models. Dayaratna et al. (2023) used the updated empirical ECS distribution estimate of Lewis (2022), which assimilates modern instrumental and paleoclimatic temperature records, and allowed for a 30 percent gain in the CO₂ fertilization benefit in the FUND model, and found that, even at a low discount rate of 2.5 percent, the median SCC as of 2050 is only \$18.67, with a 24 percent probability of the true value being negative. At a five percent discount rate the median SCC value is negative until the mid-2040s and at 2050 was only \$0.37 with a 49 percent probability of being negative. Thus, under reasonable assumptions a mainstream IAM using updated scientific inputs yields evidence consistent with the SCC not being significantly greater than zero.

It should also be noted that the SCC is focused on the social costs of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use. It does not measure the private marginal benefits to consumers and society from the availability of fossil fuels. Public willingness to pay for fuels of all types indicates the value to society of reliable, abundant fossil energy. Tol (2017) estimates that the private benefit of carbon is large relative to the social cost. This can be illustrated by noting that the price of a gallon of gas indicates the marginal value to the consumer of the fuel. Suppose we assume a relatively high Social Cost of Carbon of, say, \$75 per tonne. Deflated by a MCPF value of 1.5 that would result in a carbon tax of \$50 per tonne, which equates to about 44 cents per gallon of gas (Lavelle, 2019). A pre-tax price of \$3.00 per gallon would imply the marginal social benefit of the fuel is nearly seven times the marginal social cost.

11.2.4 Tipping points

SCC calculations typically consider gradual impacts of a warming climate, such as slowly-melting glaciers and increasing average temperature. A driver of potentially high values of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is the introduction into models of discrete catastrophic outcomes associated with abrupt changes (Dietz et al., 2021). They are often referred to as “tipping points.”

The term “tipping point” mingles two different physical concepts that pose different research challenges. Many physical systems are inherently stable unless acted upon with sufficient external energy. For example an ice cap might remain intact over a wide range of temperatures but once the temperature crosses the 0°C threshold it melts. Such discontinuities are ubiquitous in nature and require an external

force. Whether the force needs to be large relative to the size of the system depends on the underlying stability of the system.

A different type of tipping point is called a *bifurcation* and arises from the study of the internal dynamics of nonlinear systems (Crawford, 1991). Many systems have been observed to have more than one equilibrium point and can move between them with minimal or no external influence. For example a weather system might have two different equilibrium states: one calm and one with a tornado. A transition from one to another can happen either with no external force or with a minuscule change, such as a flap of the proverbial butterfly’s wings (Shen et al. 2014). The term “tipping point” is sometimes used to mean a bifurcation of this type and implies instability inherent in the system itself, which is not necessarily dependent on outside forces. It depends, instead, on parameters of the system taking values that support the emergence of bifurcations (Crawford, 1991).

The two different concepts imply different research questions. Regarding the first we are interested in whether components of the climate system are susceptible to abrupt discontinuities in response to sufficiently-large anthropogenic forcing. Regarding the second we are interested in whether the Earth’s climate system has inherent bifurcations that imply the possibility of abrupt transitions with or without external forcing.

Models have been developed that imply the latter is a possibility. Kypke et al. (2020) presented a simple climate model in which the GHG concentration is one of the parameters that controls the emergence of bifurcations of the Arctic climate to one with both cold and warm equilibria. If sufficiently high GHG forcing combined with a sufficiently high rate of ocean heat transport are imposed a bifurcation becomes possible. More generally GCMs have been observed to contain bifurcations and multiple equilibria (Brunetti and Ragon, 2023).

The possible existence of bifurcations in the Earth’s climate system implies abrupt transitions are possible, not just in response to large forcing but to small perturbations as well. This places tipping points into the category of low-likelihood and potentially catastrophic events, such as large meteor strikes. A key question to ask is whether those kinds of tipping points can be predicted. Current research has not resolved that question (Dakos et al., 2024) and indeed may not be able to since one implication of the “butterfly effect” is the existence of predictability boundaries of nonlinear systems (Palmer et al., 2014). It is therefore not obvious how to incorporate such possibilities into SCC calculations. Small variations in assumptions will lead to arbitrarily large variations in the resulting SCC with no grounds for choosing among them. If such tipping points are possible the most appropriate stance for economic policy is to maximize resilience to any form of external catastrophe since it is unlikely we could predict or prevent it from happening.

The IPCC AR6 (Chapter 1) focuses mainly on the first type of tipping point, namely an abrupt change in response to external forcing. This is also the meaning associated with popular usage of the “tipping point” concept in discussions of climate change (see <https://report-2023.global-tipping-points.org/what-is-a-tipping-point/> for example). As summarized by the IPCC AR6, there is evidence of abrupt change in the paleoclimate record, and some of these events have been interpreted as tipping points. Some projections with Earth System Models for example have produced tipping points such as Amazon forest dieback in response to specified values of CO₂ concentration or temperature increases.

The alarm surrounding climate tipping points is reflected by *The Global Tipping Points Report* that was launched at the COP28 on 6 December 2023 (Lenton et al., 2023). It identifies more than 25 parts of the climate system said to constitute tipping points. What gets classified as a climate “tipping point” is a moving target. The most common examples in the literature and assessment reports include: Greenland ice sheet disintegration, West Antarctic ice sheet disintegration, summertime disappearance of Arctic sea ice, Amazon rainforest dieback, coral reef dieoff, thawing of permafrost and methane hydrates, Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation collapse, boreal forest shift, West African monsoon shift, and Indian Monsoon shift.

All such tipping points require a certain amount of system instability in order to exhibit an abrupt transition in response to warming. For this reason there seems to be very little to discriminate between a tipping event and natural climate variability. Natural climate variability has in the past produced shifts in the West African and Indian monsoons, Amazon forest and coral reef dieback, and disintegration of the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets. These impacts can be reversed on the decadal timescales associated with natural climate variability and ecosystem responses.

Some abrupt changes are potentially more consequential, including collapse of the West Antarctic ice sheet and collapse of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC). The IPCC AR6 WG1 Summary for Policy Makers states:

The Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation is very likely to weaken over the 21st century for all emission scenarios. While there is high confidence in the 21st century decline, there is only low confidence in the magnitude of the trend. There is medium confidence that there will not be an abrupt collapse before 2100. (C.3.4)

There is limited evidence for low-likelihood, high-impact outcomes (resulting from ice-sheet instability processes characterized by deep uncertainty and in some cases involving tipping points) that would strongly increase ice loss from the Antarctic Ice Sheet for centuries under high GHG emissions scenarios (e.g., SSP5-8.5). (B.5.2)

For the purpose of SCC calculations the research question implied by this type of tipping point is whether such events have been observed in the past in climate conditions similar to what we currently experience or will in the near future. The IPCC AR6 finds little evidence for impending collapse of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation or the West Antarctic ice sheet. It finds there is no tipping point associated with Arctic Sea ice (AR6 Technical Summary p. 76)

Dietz et al. incorporated several potential tipping points (abrupt changes) into an SCC model and found they added about 25 percent to the estimate, mainly associated with thawing permafrost and release of methane hydrates. However the IPCC considers this scenario *very unlikely* (AR6 Technical Summary p. 107).

In summary, there may be unknown bifurcation tipping points that are associated with natural climate processes, but this possibility does not translate into specific guidance on the SCC. There are potential abrupt change points in the climate system in response to warming, although the IPCC assigns low probabilities to most, including the largest ones. When these have been taken into account the result is only a modest increase in the SCC value in the 21st century.

11.2.5 Are there alternatives?

It is increasingly being argued that the SCC is too variable to be useful for policymakers. Cambridge Econometrics (Thoung, 2017) stated it's "time to kill it" due to uncertainties. The UK and EU no longer use SCC for policy appraisal, opting for "target-consistent" carbon pricing (UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero 2022, Dunne 2017). However the uncertainty of SCC estimates doesn't mean that other regulatory measures are inherently better or more efficient. Many emissions regulations (such as electric vehicle mandates, renewable energy mandates, energy efficiency regulations and bans on certain types of home appliances) cost far more per tonne of abatement than any mainstream SCC estimate, which is sufficient for establishing they fail a cost-benefit test.

References

- AR6: *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report* (2021) Working Group I Contribution. www.ipcc.ch.
- Arent, D.J., R.S.J. Tol, E. Faust, J.P. Hella, S. Kumar, K.M. Strzepek, F.L. Tóth, and D. Yan (2014) Key economic sectors and services. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L. White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WGIIAR5-Chap10_FINAL.pdf
- Barker, D. (2023) Temperature Shocks and Economic Growth: Comment on Dell, Jones, and Olken. *Econ Journal Watch* 20(2) 234-253 <https://econjwatch.org/articles/temperature-shocks-and-economic-growth-comment-on-dell-jones-and-olken>
- Barrage, Lint and William Nordhaus (2024) Policies, projections, and the social cost of carbon: Results from the DICE-2023 model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (13) e2312030121 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2312030121>
- Berg, Kimberly, Chadwick C Curtis and Nelson Mark. (2021) GDP and temperature: Evidence on cross-country response heterogeneity. NBER Working Paper 31327 June 2023 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31327>
- Blickle, Kristian; Sarah N. Hamerling, and Donald P. Morgan (2021) : How bad are weather disasters for banks?, Staff Reports, No. 990, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, NY <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/247913/1/sr990.pdf>
- Brunetti, Maura and Charline Ragon (2023) Attractors and bifurcation diagrams in complex climate models. *Physical Review E* 107 054214 <https://journals.aps.org/pre/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevE.107.054214>
- Burke, Marshall, Solomon M Hsiang, and Edward Miguel (2015). Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*, 527(7577):235–239.
- Council of Economic Advisors-Office of Management and Budget (CEA-OMB 2023) Methodologies and considerations for integrating the physical and transition risks of climate change into macroeconomic forecasting for the president's budget. March 13, 2023. <https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/CEA-OMB-White-Paper.pdf>
- Crawford, John D (1991) Introduction to Bifurcation Theory. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 63(4) October 1991 991—1037.
- Dakos, Vasilis, Chris Boulton, Joshua Buxton et al. (2024) Tipping point detection and early warnings in climate, ecological, and human systems. *Earth System Dynamics* 15 1117—1135 <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-15-1117-2024>
- Dayaratna, Kevin and Ross McKittrick (2023) "Reply to comment on "climate sensitivity, agricultural productivity and the social cost of carbon in fund" by Philip Meyer" *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 2023 link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10018-023-00364-2
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and David Kreutzer (2017) Empirically-Constrained Climate Sensitivity and the Social Cost of Carbon. *Climate Change Economics* April 2017 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S2010007817500063>
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and Patrick J. Michaels (2020) Climate Sensitivity, Agricultural Productivity and the Social Cost of Carbon in FUND. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00263-w>

- Dell, Melissa, Benjamin F. Jones, and Benjamin A. Olken (2012). Temperature shocks and economic growth: Evidence from the last half century. *American economic journal: Macroeconomics*, 4(3):66–95, 2012. ISSN 1945-7707.
- Dietz, S., J. Rising, T. Stoerk, G. Wagner (2021) Economic impact of tipping points in the climate system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 2021 Vol. 118 No. 34 e2103081118
- Dunne, Daisy (2017), “Q&A: The Social Cost of Carbon,” Carbon Brief, February 14, 2017, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/qa-social-cost-carbon/>
- Formetta, Giuseppe and Luc Feyen (2019) Empirical evidence of declining global vulnerability to climate-related hazards. *Global Environmental Change* 57 101920
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.05.004>
- Greßer, Christina, Daniel Meierrieks, and David Stadelmann (2021) The link between regional temperature and regional incomes: econometric evidence with sub-national data. *Economic Policy*, 36(107):523–550, 2021.
- Haverd, V., Raupach, M., Briggs, P., et al. (2020). Higher than expected CO₂ fertilization inferred from leaf to global observations. *Global Change Biology*, 26, 2390–2402.
- Hu, Bin and Ross McKittrick (2015) Climatic Variations and the Market Value of Insurance Firms. *Journal of Insurance Issues* Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 92-111 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43741103>
- Kypke, K. L., Langford, W. F., and Willms, A. R.: Anthropocene climate bifurcation, *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, 27, 391–409, <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-27-391-2020>, 2020.
- Lavelle, Marianne (2019) Carbon Tax Plans: How They Compare and Why Oil Giants Support One of Them. *Inside Climate News* March 7, 2019 <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/07032019/carbon-tax-proposals-compare-baker-shultz-exxon-conocophillips-ccl-congress/>
- Lenton, T.M., D.I. Armstrong McKay, et al. (eds) (2023) *The Global Tipping Points Report 2023*. University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. <https://report-2023.global-tipping-points.org/>
- Lewis, N., (2013) An objective Bayesian, improved approach for applying optimal fingerprint techniques to estimate climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 26, 7414-7429.
<https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00473.1>
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended Crop Yield Meta-analysis Data do not Support Upward SCC Revision. *Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>
- Moore, Frances C. and Delavane B. Diaz (2015) Temperature impacts on economic growth warrant stringent mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(2):127–131, 2015. ISSN 1758-678X.
- Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>
- Newell, Richard G., Brian C. Prest, and Steven E. Sexton (2021). The GDP-temperature relationship: Implications for climate change damages. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 108 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102445>
- Nordhaus, William (2006). Geography and macroeconomics: New data and new findings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(10):3510–3517, 2006. ISSN 0027-8424.
- Nordhaus, William. (2018) Projections and Uncertainties About Climate Change in an Era of Minimal Climate Policies. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* August 2018, 10(3): 333-360. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/pol.20170046>
- Nordhaus, W. (1993) Optimal Greenhouse-Gas Reductions and Tax Policy in the "DICE" Model *American Economic Review* Vol. 83, No. 2, (Papers and Proceedings) pp.313-317.
- Palmer, TN, A Döring and G Seregin (2014) The real butterfly effect. *Nonlinearity* 27(9) 10.1088/0951-7715/27/9/R123 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/0951-7715/27/9/R123/meta>
- Parry, Ian, Robertson C. Williams III and Lawrence H. Goulder (1999). “When Can Carbon Abatement Policies Increase Welfare? The Fundamental Role of Distorted Factor Markets.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 37: 52—84.
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2018): Tracking progress on the economic costs of disasters under the indicators of the sustainable development goals, *Environmental Hazards*, DOI: 10.1080/17477891.2018.1540343

- Pielke Jr., Roger (2020) Economic ‘normalisation’ of disaster losses 1998–2020: a literature review and assessment,” *Environmental Hazards*, 2020, pp. 1-19
- Pielke Jr., Roger (2022) Global disaster losses: 1990-2023 Substack essay
<https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/global-disaster-losses1990-2023>
- Resources for the Future (2025) “Social Cost of Carbon Explorer,” Resources for the Future website, accessed April 22, 2025, <https://www.rff.org/publications/data-tools/scc-explorer/>.
- Roe, Gerard H. and Yoram Bauman (2013) Climate Sensitivity: Should the climate tail wag the policy dog? *Climatic Change* (2013) 117:647–662 DOI 10.1007/s10584-012-0582-6
- Schelling, Thomas C (1992) Some economics of global warming. *The American Economic Review*, 82 (1):1–14.
- Shen, Bo-Wen, Roger A Pielke Sr and Xubin Zeng (2023) The 50th Anniversary of the Metaphorical Butterfly Effect since Lorenz (1972): Multistability, Multiscale Predictability, and Sensitivity in Numerical Models. *Atmosphere* 2023 14(8) <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos14081279>
- Storm, S (2017) “How the Invisible Hand is Supposed to Adjust the Natural Thermostat: A Guide for the Perplexed.” *Science and Engineering Ethics* vol 23: 1307—1331.
- Thoung, Chris (2017) “Is It Time to Kill Off the Social Cost of Carbon?” Cambridge Econometrics Blog, September 14, 2017, <https://www.camecon.com/blog/time-kill-social-cost-carbon/>.
- Tol, Richard S.J. (1997) On the optimal control of carbon dioxide emissions: an application of FUND *Environmental Modeling and Assessment* 2: 151—163.
- Tol, Richard S.J. (2017). "The Private Benefit of Carbon and its Social Cost," Working Paper Series 0717, Department of Economics, University of Sussex Business School.
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/sus/susewp/0717.html>
- UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2022). “Carbon Valuation.” GOV.UK, last updated April 4, 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/carbon-valuation--2>.
- US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, “Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review”, EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf accessed February 28, 2024.
- Yang, Yimin, Fei Jia, and Haoran Li. Estimation of panel data models with mixed sampling frequencies (2023). *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3):514–544.
- Zhao, Xiaobing, Mason Gerety, and Nicolai V. Kuminoff (2018) Revisiting the temperature-economic growth relationship using global subnational data. *Journal of environmental management*, 223:537–544, 2018.

12 GLOBAL CLIMATE IMPACTS OF U.S. EMISSIONS POLICIES

Chapter Summary

U.S. policy actions are expected to have undetectably small direct impacts on the global climate and any effects will emerge only with long delays.

12.1 The scale problem

The emissions rates and atmospheric concentrations of criteria air contaminants are closely connected because their lifetimes are short and their concentrations are small; when local emissions are reduced the local pollution concentration drops rapidly, usually within a few days. But the global average CO₂ concentration behaves very differently, since emissions mix globally and the global carbon cycle is vast and slow. Any change in local CO₂ emissions today will have only a very small global effect, and only with a long delay.

Following the emission of a pulse (release) of CO₂ into the atmosphere only about 40 ± 15 percent of the emitted CO₂ will have been sequestered after twenty years. That fraction rises to 75 ± 10 percent after a thousand years, and the remainder will be gradually removed over the ensuing tens of thousands of years (Ciais et al., 2013, pp. 472-473). Consequently, any reduction in U.S. emissions would only modestly slow, but not prevent, the rise of global CO₂ concentration. And even if global emissions were to stop tomorrow, it would take decades or centuries to see a meaningful reduction in the global CO₂ concentration and hence human influences on the climate.

Reducing the atmospheric stock of CO₂ would require emissions to fall below the natural sequestration rate, assuming the entire increase is anthropogenic. Since that rate has been averaging about 50% of emissions in recent decades, a reduction of global emissions by 50% would (at least temporarily) halt the rise in atmospheric CO₂. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol proposed to cap industrial nations' CO₂ emissions at a modest five percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012. Even though this policy was too difficult for most nations to implement, full compliance would not have substantially reduced atmospheric CO₂ levels. It would only have slightly slowed CO₂ growth, reaching the projected year 2100 level in 2105 instead (Wigley, 1998). Lomborg (2016) estimated that full compliance with the Paris Accord would not stop warming, it would only prevent about 0.1C warming and delay hitting the baseline year 2100 temperature levels by about a decade.

Thus, in contrast with conventional air pollution control, even drastic local actions will have negligible local effects, and only with a long delay. The practice of referring to unilateral US reductions as “combatting climate change” or “taking action on climate” therefore reflects a profound misunderstanding of the scale of the issue.

12.2 Case study: US motor vehicle emissions

The scale problem can be illustrated with reference to U.S. motor vehicles. The EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding focused on CO₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks in the U.S. because Section 202(a) of Clean Air Act mandates the EPA to set emissions standards for motor vehicles if pollutants are found to endanger public health or welfare. The 2009 Endangerment Finding therefore obligated the EPA to regulate emissions from new motor vehicles, ostensibly to reduce or eliminate climate-related harms to the US public.

Two questions that naturally arise are: (1) How large a reduction in CO₂ emissions would result from such regulation? and (2) What would be the climate impact of such regulation?

The first question can be addressed by comparing US vehicle-based CO₂ emissions to the global total. The second question can be addressed by using the fact that the reduction in global warming would be, according to the models relied upon by the EPA, proportional to the reduction in global emissions, keeping in mind that the change in the CO₂ content of the atmosphere in any given year is the result of total global CO₂ emissions, not just U.S. emissions.

In 2022, the emissions from U.S. cars and light duty trucks totaled 1.05 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide (GtCO₂, EPA 2024). Meanwhile global CO₂ emissions from energy use totaled 34.6 GtCO₂ (Energy Institute 2024). Hence U.S. cars and light trucks account for only 3.0% of global energy-related CO₂ emissions. To a first approximation we can say that even eliminating all US vehicle-based emissions would change the multidecadal warming trend by at most 3%. For the period 1979-2023, which has the most extensive global coverage of a variety of weather data types, warming trends are determined to a precision of about $\pm 15\%$, so the impact of reducing the rate of global warming by eliminating U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be far below the limits of measurability.

Given that global-average temperature is the most direct climate change metric, impacts on any secondary climate metrics (e.g. severe weather, floods, drought, etc.) from reducing U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be even less measurable.

Consequently, in contrast to the case of local air contaminants like particulates and ozone, even the most aggressive regulatory actions on GHG emissions from U.S. vehicles cannot be expected to remediate alleged climate dangers to the US public on any even remotely-measurable scale.

References

- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, et al. (2013): Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA
- EPA (2024) *Fast Facts: U.S. Transportation Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2022*. Available online at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockkey=P101AKR0.pdf>
- Energy Institute (2024) Statistical Review of World Energy. Available online at <https://www.energyinst.org/statistical-review>
- Lomborg, Bjorn (2016) “Impact of Current Climate Proposals” *Global Policy* 7(1) 109—118. Available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12295/full>.
- Wigley, T.M.L. (1998). “The Kyoto Protocol: CO₂, CH₄ and climate implications.” *Geophysical Research Letters* 25(13), 2285-2288

GLOSSARY

2XCO₂: Doubling of the atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂), a commonly used baseline for addressing climate change. In 2025, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were approximately 50% of the way to 2XCO₂ compared to 1800.

ABATEMENT: In the context of environmental policy, the reduction of emissions.

ACE (Accumulated Cyclone Energy): A statistical measure of a tropical cyclone's energy accumulated over its lifetime, calculated from a summation of the square of maximum sustained wind speeds.

ACIDIFICATION: A commonly used term for the reduction in ocean pH from more alkaline to less alkaline values.

ACRIM (Active Cavity Radiometer Irradiance Monitor) GAP: the gap in total solar irradiance data between 1989 and 1991 caused by a delay in the launch of a satellite-borne monitor in time to overlap and intercalibrate with the prior system.

AEROSOLS: Tiny solid or liquid particles suspended in the air.

ALKALINE: Having a chemical pH greater than 7.0. The “opposite” of acidic, which means a pH less than 7.0.

AMBIENT: Relating to the immediate surroundings of something.

ANTHROPOGENIC: Created by humans.

AR (Assessment Reports): Periodic assessments published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change evaluating current knowledge of the climate system, global change, and associated issues. An AR now consists of reports from three working groups, the first (WG1) concerned with physical science and the others concerned with societal impacts and mitigation strategies. The most recent was the AR6.

ATTRIBUTION: Assertion of a causal relation, chiefly from anthropogenic GHG emissions to observed climate patterns.

AUTOCORRELATION: The phenomenon in which the current value of a random time series variable is correlated with its value in a previous time period.

BIOMASS: The total quantity or weight of organic matter in a given area or volume.

CARBON: The 6th element in the periodic table. Popularly used as a shorthand term for carbon dioxide.

CMIP (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project): The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's organized effort to compare many different global ocean-atmosphere climate models when they are all forced with the same emissions scenario(s). The two most recent were the CMIP5 and CMIP6 for, respectively, AR5 and AR6.

CONUS: The contiguous 48 U.S. states.

DICE (Dynamic Integrated model of the Climate and Economy): An Integrated Assessment Model developed by William Nordhaus in 1993.

DISCOUNT RATE: The interest rate used to convert future costs and benefits into their present value. Varies inversely with present value so a high discount rate reduces the present value of future costs and benefits.

DRY ICE: Frozen carbon dioxide.

ECONOMETRICS: The branch of economics concerned with the use of statistical methods (chiefly multiple regression) to analyse economic systems.

ECS (Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity): The total amount of eventual global-average surface warming in response to a hypothetical doubling of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration compared to pre-Industrial levels.

EL NIÑO: The warm phase of the El Niño – Southern Oscillation, involving weaker upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and weaker Pacific trade winds.

EMISSIONS SCENARIO: An assumed scenario of future greenhouse gas emissions (or resulting atmospheric concentrations) based upon assumptions regarding global economic activity, the prevalence of fossil fuel use, and (sometimes) global carbon cycle model estimates of the rate of CO₂ uptake by land and ocean.

ENDANGERMENT FINDING (EF): The 2009 finding by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that emissions of well-mixed greenhouse gases (primarily CO₂) endanger human health and welfare.

ENSO: El Niño – Southern Oscillation, a prominent natural climate fluctuation involving year-to-year variations in the upwelling of cold water off the equatorial coast of South America and associated strengthening or weakening of trade winds across the Pacific Ocean.

FACE: (Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment) Large-scale open-air studies that expose plants to elevated CO₂ levels, simulating future climate scenarios.

FOSSIL FUEL: A natural hydrocarbon fuel such as coal, oil, or natural gas formed in the geological past from the remains of living organisms.

FUND (Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation, and Distribution): An Integrated Assessment Model developed by Richard Tol in 1997.

GBR (Great Barrier Reef): The world's largest coral reef ecosystem located off the northeast coast of Australia.

GDP (Gross Domestic Product): Total market value of all the final goods and services produced within a country's border, usually over one year.

GHCN (Global Historical Climatology Network): A time-varying number of globally distributed weather stations making hourly, daily, or monthly measurements of precipitation, temperature and sometimes snowfall and snow depth.

GLOBAL GREENING: The satellite-observed increase in greenness in most vegetated land areas observed since the early 1980s.

GNP (Gross National Product): Total market value of all the final goods and services produced by the citizens of a country, including exports and imports, usually over one year.

GDP (Gross National Product): Total market value of all the domestically-produced final goods and services produced by the citizens of a country, usually over one year.

GREENHOUSE EFFECT (GHE): The tendency for any planetary atmosphere containing greenhouse gases to be warmer in the lowest layers than if those gases did not exist.

GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG): An atmospheric gas that absorbs and emits infrared radiation, especially water vapor, CO₂, and methane.

HURST PHENOMENON: See long term persistence.

HYDROLOGY: The study of the movement of water, especially on land and in the atmosphere.

IAM (Integrated Assessment Model): A computerized tool that combines economics, climate science, and social sciences to provide quantitative relationships between human and Earth systems, helping to inform policy decisions.

IEA (International Energy Agency): A Paris-based intergovernmental organization, established in 1974, that provides policy recommendations, analysis and data on the global energy sector.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change): A panel of international experts and governmental representatives established by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988 to provide governments at all levels with scientific information that they can use to develop climate policies.

IR (Infrared): Heat radiation that all solid objects and greenhouse gases emit by virtue of their temperature.

LA NIÑA: The cool phase of ENSO, involving stronger upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and stronger Pacific trade winds.

LONG TERM PERSISTENCE (LTP, or HURST PHENOMENON): A form of autocorrelation in which random fluctuations induce long term but not permanent changes in the mean value of a series, which shows up in some climate data series as cyclical or trending patterns on short time scales.

MAIZE: Corn.

MODEL: A computer code or collection of codes which quantify our knowledge of various processes and the interactions between those processes.

MORTALITY: Death or number of deaths, usually expressed for a specific population and period.

NCA (National Climate Assessment): A periodic report mandated by the Global Change Research Act of 1990 summarizing the impact of climate change on the United States. There have been five NCA reports: NCA1 (2000), NCA2 (2009), NCA3 (2014), NCA4 (2017-18), and NCA5 (2023).

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development): A group of 38 member countries that have a democratic system of government and free economic systems.

PALEOCLIMATE: Climate of the distant past, before modern weather instruments were widely used (typically pre-1850), necessitating the use of “proxy” measurements such as tree rings, ice core, pollen records, etc.

PDI (Power Dissipation Index): A statistical estimate of the accumulated destructive potential of a tropical cyclone over time, calculated as a summation of the cube of the maximum sustained wind speeds.

PHOTOSYNTHESIS: The process by which plants grow, requiring carbon dioxide, water, and light at sufficiently warm temperatures (10 to 35 deg. C for optimal function).

PPM: Parts per million, a measure of the concentration of a substance in (for example) the atmosphere

PRE-INDUSTRIAL: The near-term historical period before which human greenhouse gas emissions were considered significant, usually assumed to be the mid-1700s.

RADIATIVE FEEDBACK: A change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in surface temperature.

RADIATIVE FORCING: The change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in greenhouse gases, anthropogenic aerosols, volcanoes, etc.

RCP (Representative Concentration Pathway) SCENARIOS: Different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report (AR5). RCP scenarios have a number label (e.g. RCP6.0) indicating how much radiative forcing they

assume in 2100 relative to pre-Industrial times, in Watts per square meter. RCP4.5 and RCP6.0 are intermediate scenarios, whereas RCP8.5 is an extreme scenario with very large future emissions of greenhouse gases.

REGRESSION: A statistical method for selecting the coefficients of a linear equation to explain the behaviour of a dependent variable in terms of variations in one or more explanatory variables.

RICARDIAN ANALYSIS: A method used in environmental economics named after David Ricardo to estimate the economic impacts of climate change, particularly on agriculture, by making use of the hypothesis that expected changes in the return to future agricultural activity will be capitalized into current land values.

SCC (Social Cost of Carbon): An estimate of the net economic damages, measured in present-value dollars, caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂ into the atmosphere.

SSP (Shared Socioeconomic Pathway) SCENARIOS: Different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). Some of the SSP scenarios are analogous to the older RCP scenarios, for purposes of continuity and comparison to earlier climate model assessments.

TC: Tropical cyclone.

TMAX: The daily maximum surface air temperature.

TMIN: The daily minimum surface air temperature.

TOA: Top of atmosphere.

TOXICOLOGY: The study of the adverse effects of chemical substances on living organisms.

TREND: A coefficient, usually estimated using linear regression, representing the slope of a line of best fit through a time series of data, indicating any tendency for the series mean to move up or down over time.

TSI (Total Solar Irradiance): The measure of the total amount of incident solar radiation per unit area, including all wavelengths of electromagnetic radiation, that reaches the Earth's atmosphere. Typically shown in units of watts per square meter (W/m²).

UHI (Urban Heat Island): The tendency for inhabited areas to be warmer than their rural surroundings, due to the replacement of natural land and vegetation with roads, parking lots, buildings, and waste heat sources.

USHCN: The U.S. Historical Climatology Network, consisting of quality-controlled temperature and precipitation data from 1,218 surface weather stations.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John Christy, Ph.D. is the Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Earth Sciences and Alabama's State Climatologist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He has a B.A. (Mathematics) from CSU Fresno and an M.S. and Ph.D. (Atmospheric Sciences) from the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign. He is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society and recipient of The NASA Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement for constructing, with Dr. Roy Spencer, the first global atmospheric temperature dataset from polar orbiting satellites. He served as Lead Author of the 3rd IPCC Assessment Report (2001), he has coauthored National Academy of Science expert reports on Climate Observations (1995) and Surface Temperature Reconstructions (2006), and he has served on the NOAA Climate Change Science Program, NASA's Earth Science Subcommittee, the National Research Council Space Studies Board and the EPA Science Advisory Board. In addition, Dr. Christy has given testimony in 20 Congressional Hearings.

Judith Curry, Ph.D. is Professor Emerita at the Georgia Institute of Technology, where she served as Chair of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences for 13 years. She is President and co-founder of Climate Forecast Applications Network (CFAN). Curry has a PhD in Geophysical Sciences from the University of Chicago. She has authored or coauthored 192 peer-reviewed papers in atmospheric and climate sciences, two textbooks, and most recently the book *Climate Uncertainty and Risk*. Curry is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, and a Member of the American Academy of Sciences and Letters.

The Honorable Steven E. Koonin, Ph.D. is the Edward Teller Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Institution. He has served as Under Secretary for Science at the Department of Energy (2009-2011), as Chief Scientist for British Petroleum (2004-2009), and as a professor at Caltech (1975 – 2004, the last nine years as Vice President and Provost). Koonin is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the JASON group of government advisors, as well as a Governor of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, having served in similar capacities for the Los Alamos, Sandia, Brookhaven, and Argonne National Laboratories. Other prior roles include a University Professor at New York University, a non-resident Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and a Trustee of IDA. Koonin has a BS in Physics from Caltech and a PhD in Theoretical Physics from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He authored the 2021 bestseller *Unsettled: What Climate Science Tells Us, What It Doesn't, and Why It Matters*, the 1985 textbook *Computational Physics*, and some 200 peer-reviewed papers in physics and astrophysics, scientific computation, energy technology and policy, and climate science.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D., is a Professor of Environmental Economics at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada. He holds a BA in economics from Queen's University, and an MA and Ph.D. in economics from the University of British Columbia. He has published widely in both economics and physical science journals on topics related to climate change, pollution and public policy. His book *Economic Analysis of Environmental Policy* was published by the University of Toronto Press in 2010. His background in applied statistics has led him to author or coauthor peer-reviewed publications across a wide range of topics in the physical sciences including paleoclimate reconstruction, malaria transmission, surface temperature measurement, climate attribution methodology and climate model evaluation. Professor McKittrick has made many invited academic presentations around the world, and has testified before the US Congress and committees of the Canadian House of Commons and Senate.

Roy W. Spencer, Ph.D., is a Principal Research Scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. He holds a BS in Atmospheric and Oceanic Science from the University of Michigan, and MS and PhD in Meteorology from the University of Wisconsin -Madison. Spencer's published research has focused on monitoring of weather processes and climate change from Earth-orbiting satellites, as well as using simple physical models for diagnosing climate sensitivity and climate feedbacks. As a NASA Senior Scientist for Climate Studies he served as the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer (AMSR-E) flying on the Aqua satellite, providing our most accurate global measurements of sea surface temperatures, sea ice, and several other features of the climate system. Along with Dr. John Christy, Spencer developed the first satellite-based technique for global temperature monitoring, for which they received NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal and the American Meteorological Society's Special Award.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@cfanclimate.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Roy W. Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Table 12.12

Here is an idea. I suggest moving IPCC Table 12.12 to the attribution chapter (the actual table from the AR6), with a new section on attribution of impact drivers (we can discuss the whole table); that way we avoid the mismatch of the table being in a chapter of detection of extreme events. So the new outline for attribution chapter would be:

- 9 Uncertainties in Attribution
 - 9.1 Introduction
 - 9.2 Attribution methods
 - 9.3 Attribution of global warming
 - 9.4 Attribution of impact drivers
 - 9.5 Extreme event attribution
 - 9.6 Summary

Let me know if you like this idea

On Wed, May 14, 2025 at 4:18 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

That works. Thanks.

SEK

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 7:17 PM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>
Cc: Judith Curry <curry.judith@cfanclimate.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: New folder: 01.Report Draft

This should get you in

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=1lz3qj9v46e1t5f4ywwxq7p8c&dl=0

This is for the parent folder. Let me know if it doesn't work.

On Wed, May 14, 2025 at 6:41 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Can you please send a link to the new folder?

Thanks.

Steven E. Koonin

> On May 14, 2025, at 15:27, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

> Following our meeting today I created a new folder containing clean copies (all past tracked changes accepted) of all chapters.

> There are some marginal queries and in-line comments remaining to be resolved, missing Figure captions in a couple of places etc. If you are able to supply the missing info go ahead and do so. We will soon need to sign off on final text versions so please read through them.

> I propose that these should be the versions we talk through next week.

>

> Question: should there be a single list of references at the very end or should each chapter have its own reference list? Initially I thought the former but now I lean towards the latter.

>

From: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]
Sent: 7/7/2025 4:49:34 PM
To: Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]; Roy W. Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; John Christy [climateman60@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Josh Loucks [loucksj14@gmail.com]; Cohen, Seth [seth.cohen@hq.doe.gov]
Subject: Texas Floods
Attachments: NCA-TxFloods.[RM].July07.docx

Here is a draft section on the Texas Floods. There are indicated sub-headings for detailed info on the local geography and the timeline of events. Roy maybe you could write something on those, and John and Judy will likely have info to add as well.

There is a snarky line or two which I expect Judy will cross out but enjoy them in the meantime. It's quite something what garbage NCA5 is.

I re-did the Austin precip results. In the process I realized I had multiplied some series by 100 to make the tables and figures in our JHydrol paper look better. It doesn't affect any of the sign or significance calculations in our trend tables, just trend units. So I've tidied all that up and re-generated all the results for the CWG25 and NCA reports. I'll make those amendments either later today or in the next few days before I forget. I'll have to post a new Mendeley archive which is a pain.

We head out tomorrow morning from Guelph to Lansing overnight then on to Chicago on Wednesday. No sign of baby Rowan yet, we likely have a few days to get there and get unpacked.

NCA5 and the July 2025 Kerrville Flash Flood Disaster

Introduction

In July 2025 a sudden flash flood devastated the region of Kerrville TX causing over 80 deaths and massive local damage. The Guadalupe River rose over 30 feet in xx hours following the landfall of Tropical Storm Barry on July xx. When tragic weather events occur many questions arise: Did forecasters, including the National Weather Service, give adequate warning? Could the loss of life have been prevented? Are existing flood control measures adequate? Nowadays some climate-related questions also arise: Are such events becoming more common or more severe? Are they being made worse by anthropogenic emissions of GHGs? If so, does this change how we should adapt and mitigate risks in the future?

There is an unfortunate tendency on the part of some observers to try to blame such disasters on greenhouse gases, as if to suggest that a specific weather event would not have happened if only governments had adopted more aggressive climate mitigation policies. This involves chains of hypothetical reasoning that go far beyond what science can establish and is unproductive for the purpose of helping society deal optimally with climate risks.

In this section we ask whether NCA5 played a constructive role in helping weather and disaster planning authorities in Texas mitigate the harm from the 2025 floods. NCA5 authors made the decision to address extreme weather at length; our question is whether they did so in a way that provided actionable information and useful guidance, bearing in mind that planning authorities need to allocate scarce resources. Funds allocated to one type of potential hazard in one location are unavailable for mitigating another hazard elsewhere. While it is worth trying to determine if trends are detectable and whether GHGs may contribute to the frequency or severity of weather disasters, making such a determination does not automatically imply that the NCA should advocate for adoption of renewable energy or any other emission mitigation options. Doing so impinges on decision-making by specialized planning bodies. If the ultimate goal is prevention of harm and preservation of lives, resources might be better spent on, for instance, upgrading dam and drainage infrastructure, improving warning systems and evacuation protocols, etc. Such decisions need to be made by competent local authorities once they have the best possible information at their disposal.

An NCA, if done well, can provide some of that information. Unfortunately, while NCA4 went part way towards that goal, NCA5 failed badly. A local authority looking to it for guidance would have found it worse than useless. It declares all climate threats to be getting worse, making it impossible to set planning priorities. It provided only cursory treatment of adaptation options and relentlessly advocated for adopting renewables. Thus, it sought to persuade rather than inform, making it unreliable as a decision-support asset.

Geographical and meteorological aspects of the flood

- Details about the region and the known weather risks

Timeline of events

- NWS warnings; local responses or lack thereof


Rainfall data summary for Austin TX

Our trend analysis (McKittrick and Christy 2025) for the nearby Austin TX monitoring station, which provides daily records from 1873 to 2025, show the following.

Metric	Start year	Trend	CI lower	CI upper	Sig (5%)
1-day total	1873	-0.006	-0.051	0.040	0
	1950	0.084	0.000	0.168	1
	1980	0.064	-0.142	0.270	0
2-day total	1873	-0.006	-0.102	0.080	0
	1950	0.168	0.000	0.336	1
	1980	0.128	-0.285	0.540	0
Average on non-zero days	1873	-0.001	-0.003	0.000	0
	1950	0.001	0.000	0.002	0
	1980	0.002	0.000	0.003	1
Variance	1873	-0.019	-0.065	0.026	0
	1950	0.052	-0.002	0.107	0
	1980	0.075	-0.094	0.245	0
Annual maximum	1873	-0.004	-0.013	0.005	0
	1950	0.011	-0.002	0.024	0
	1980	0.014	-0.030	0.057	0
Annual 99 th percentile exceedances	1873	-0.008	-0.017	0.002	0
	1950	0.008	-0.020	0.035	0
	1980	0.028	-0.027	0.084	0

Table: trends in various rainfall metrics for Austin TX from indicated start year to 2024. Trend units for 1- and 2-day totals and average on non-zero days: inches per year; Variance: squared inches, Annual maximum: inches per year. Annual 99th pctile exceedances: event counts. CI denotes 95% Confidence Interval bounds. Sig (5%): statistically significant at 5%, 0=No, 1=Yes.

Annual Total Precipitation (inches):




1-day and 2-day totals: The trends over 1873-2024 are negative and insignificant, they become positive and significant over 1950-2024 then shrink slightly and become insignificant again after 1980. There were more years of higher overall average rainfall early in the sample. Also, if the post-

1950 trend were driven by global warming it should intensify after 1980 rather than weaken. For average rainfall on non-zero days the trend is negative and insignificant 1873-2024 then becomes positive post-1950 but remains small and insignificant.


The trend in the annual rainfall variance is negative and insignificant 1873-2024 and positive and insignificant post-1950.

Annual maximum rainfall:



The trend in the annual maximum rainfall is negative and insignificant 1873-2024 then becomes positive post-1950 but remains small and insignificant. Post 1980 the trend is +0.014 inches per year.

Annual 99th percentile exceedances:



The trend in the number of annual exceedances of the sample 99th percentile rainfall total is negative and insignificant 1873-2024 then becomes positive post-1950 but remains small and insignificant.

In summary the regional precipitation data does not point to an increasing trend in overall annual rainfall or in metrics of extreme precipitation or variability. Likewise, streamflow records show no evidence that floods in the area are becoming more or less common. The planning focus should be on understanding and preparing for the potential weather-related risks as revealed by historical data. This includes the full potential range of flood characteristics on major floodplains in the area especially in the aftermath of landfalling tropical storms.

NCA4 makes statements consistent with these findings, although with less detail. It admitted that regional precipitation trends are unclear. It notes a decreasing trend in summertime extratropical

cyclone activity across North America since 1979 (p. 213) but evidence of increasing episodes of extreme rainfall from U.S. landfalling tropical cyclones (p. 214). It notes that precipitation trends are not clearly attributed to anthropogenic forcing (pp. 213-214) and there is low confidence in attribution. It states that there is no robust evidence that trends are attributable to human activities (p. 240) and that increases in flooding rates are detected only in 1/3 of locations in central US (p. 240-241). Finally it states

[In] U.S. regions, no formal attribution of precipitation changes to anthropogenic forcing has been made so far, so indirect attribution of flooding changes is not possible. Hence, no formal attribution of observed flooding changes to anthropogenic forcing has been claimed. (NCA4 p. 241)

This would support a conclusion that the focus of resource allocation should be adaptation to the known current risk profiles of each region and that there is little to be gained by trying to forecast changes under greenhouse forcing, nor would GHG emission reductions be an effective way to reduce future flood risks.


NCA5 as a planning tool

Does NCA5 contain information that would have been of any use to regional planners? No, we judge it to have been worse than useless. It presents no data on precipitation patterns and no information on the nature of specific potential hazards in “flash flood ally” or other high-risk areas, and it makes sweeping unsubstantiated claims to the effect that every climate risk is getting worse over time. For example, in Chapter 26 (Southern Great Plains) the first Key Message is (p. 26-7):

Climate change is beginning to alter how we live in the Southern Great Plains, putting us at risk from climate hazards that degrade our lands and waters, quality of life, health and well-being, and cultural interconnectedness (*high confidence*). Many climate hazards are expected to become more frequent, intense, or prolonged; to broaden in spatial extent; and to result in more people experiencing costly, deadly, or stressful climate-related conditions (*very likely, high confidence*). To address the growing risk, effective climate-resilient actions include implementing nature-based solutions; valuing Indigenous, traditional, and local knowledges; and infusing climate change solutions into community planning (*medium confidence*).

The tone is that of a mediocre student struggling to write an essay on a topic he has never studied. By saying every hazard is getting worse the document is both inaccurate and useless for local authorities who must set priorities and make resource allocation decisions. The same chapter presents rainfall projections through the mid-21st century (Figure 26.10) that imply drying throughout southern TX, but no explanation is given as to how this reconciles with projections of increasing extreme precipitation in the same region (Figure 2.12 p. 2-25) or the lack of observed trends either way. The first discussion of regional trends in heavy rainfall events is on page 26-22 which focuses entirely on sports teams having to move events indoors which results in “increasing participation costs and decreasing access to sports, especially for lower-income populations.” Their adaptation advice consists of the following cartoon on page 26-19:

Resilience Actions to Address the Impacts of Heavier Rainfall Events on Businesses



Resilience actions can help businesses and industries reduce the negative consequences of more heavy rainfall events.

Figure 26.11. An increased number of heavy rainfall events affects business and industry across the Southern Great Plains through flooding of facilities and infrastructure, inundation of agricultural fields, interruptions to outdoor operations, and disruptions to transportation and logistics. The example adaptation and mitigation actions can increase resilience and reduce negative impacts. Figure credit: See figure metadata for contributors.

Figure: screenshot of NCA5 Figure 26.11

Once again, the advice is so vacuous it could have been written by someone who has never studied the topic. Combined with its pervasive advocacy for renewable energy NCA5 is worse than simply unhelpful: if planners based serious decisions on it they would misallocate scarce resources away from beneficial measures towards worthless ones, to the detriment of the U.S.

A well-constructed NCA6 could contribute to climate risk management by providing accurate and objective information on specific and predictable local risks, such as flash floods in TX, wildfires in CA, hurricanes in FL, etc. NCA6 should canvass relevant historical data and describe key baseline metrics related to extreme weather. It should identify where there are trends while being honest and transparent about uncertainties. It should be written with a view to serving the needs of decision-makers charged with allocating resources for risk management.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 10:30 AM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Travis Fisher; Roy Spencer; cohen.seth1994@gmail.com; Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Josh Loucks
Subject: text for intro
Attachments: NCA intro.docx

Attached is some text for the intro (not obvious where this would fit in Steve's outline)

NCA5's Interpretation of its Mission

:



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

NCA5's interpretation of its mission

USGCRP was established by Presidential Initiative in 1989 and mandated by Congress in the Global Change Research Act (GCRA) of 1990 to develop and coordinate “a comprehensive and integrated United States research program which will assist the Nation and the world to understand, assess, predict, and respond to human-induced and natural processes of global change.”

The National Climate Assessment (NCA) Reports evolved from the GCRA requirement to

“Prepare and submit to the President and the Congress an assessment which (1) integrates, evaluates, and interprets the findings of the Program and discusses the scientific uncertainties associated with such findings; (2) analyzes the effects of global change on the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, human health and welfare, human social systems, and biological diversity; and (3) analyzes current trends in global change, both human-induced and natural, and projects major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years.”

The five NCA Reports to date have interpreted this mandate in different ways:

- NCA1 (2000) was a multidisciplinary effort to study and portray in regional detail the potential effects of human-induced global warming on the United States.
- In addition to focusing on the potential consequences of climate change, NCA2 (2009) was a relatively short report that also sought to identify potential measures to adapt to climate change and to identify the highest research priorities for the future.
- NCA3 (2014) was an expanded effort that continued along the lines of NCA2, and was distinguished by a comprehensive review process, including a review by the National Academy of Sciences.
- NCA4 (2017/2018) was an expanded effort published in two volumes: I Climate Science Special Report, and II Impacts, Risk, and Adaptation in the United States. This was the first NCA report to devote significant effort to assessing actual climate science. NCA4 introduced a traceability analysis for each key finding, including a cursory description of uncertainties.
- NCA5 (2023) returned to a single volume format, reducing discussion of climate science to a cursory two chapters, with continuing with a focus on regional and sectoral impacts of climate change. NCA5 expanded its remit to topics that are arguably outside the purview of the USGCRP, focusing on “Climate Action” and policy recommendations with a social justice emphasis.

How do these interpretations align with the statutory requirements of the GCRA? Only NCA4 gives serious consideration to climate science, which is a major part of USGCRP funding. Natural climate variability is essentially dismissed as unimportant in NCA4 and barely mentioned in NCA5, in spite of the mandate to include both human-caused and natural climate change. Most significantly, NCA5 has redirected the focus away from climate science and even the hazard elements of impacts, towards evaluation of societal vulnerabilities and advocacy for particular policy options, especially wind and solar power. The cover image for the NCA5 Report is the installation of a solar panel.

As such, the NCA Reports, and particularly the NCA5, are in many ways non-compliant with the GCRA mandate:

- Failure to adequately assess climate science (with the exception of NCA4)
- Failure to consider natural climate variability
- Failure to adequately assess uncertainties.

Further, the confidence levels in the NCA reports are vastly inflated, based on terminology alone. NCA5 conclusions with *medium confidence* are justified by “Suggestive evidence (a few sources, limited consistency, models incomplete, methods emerging, etc.) competing schools of thought. NCA conclusions with *high confidence* are justified by “Moderate evidence (several sources, some consistency, methods vary and/or documentation limited, etc.), medium consensus.

In summary, the NCA reports have arguably been off the mark since the inception of the program. There are many topics that the NCA should have considered but didn't, and the NCA5 in particular has considered topics outside the remit of the USGCRP. The neglect of critical topics and credible uncertainty analyses has led to bias in the reports.

As such, the NCA reports are not an objective source of information to inform U.S. policy. Examples are provided in the remainder of the report.

From: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]
Sent: 5/10/2025 3:11:31 PM
To: Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]; Roy W. Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; John Christy [climatemanager60@gmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@googlemail.com]
Subject: The week upcoming
Attachments: 00.May10.Fulldraft.docx

I just had a read through of the chapters and for fun put them into a single word doc to see what we've got in terms of length. It's about 150 pages, so it looks like we'll tick both the quality and quantity boxes. I attached the draft for your interest but I'm not putting it into Dropbox bc we've still got work to do on each chapter.

Going through the chapters in the 00.draft folder I am not sure the ones posted there include everyone's most recent edits. It's sometimes hard for me to catch all the email attachments. My suggestion is everyone go through the chapters and see if there are edits you want to include that are not reflected in the posted draft and if so, save a new version to the Dropbox with the naming format Ch number/Ch name/Date/[initials]. We may accumulate several editions of each chapter but then we'll know what we're working with. If you need me to put it in the Dropbox send it as a separate email (not a reply to an existing chain).

Also in some chapters people have inserted figures without captions and/or sources. Please provide them.

Roy and I have to travel to DC Tuesday but I'd like to suggest we arrange a zoom meeting later in the week to talk through the remaining issues chapter by chapter. I propose Wednesday afternoon but I can make other times available. That gives everyone time to go through what we've now got and then 2 weeks to finish. There are substantial document production steps needed, including formatting, fixing the references and compiling the complete list, getting figure reproduction permissions, etc.

Ross

United States Department of Energy

Climate Science, Greenhouse Gases
and the Management of US Weather Risks

Report of the Climate Science Advisory Group

May 28, 2025

Climate Science, Greenhouse Gases
and the Management of US Weather Risks

Report of the Climate Science Advisory Group

John Christy, Ph.D.

Judith Curry, Ph.D.

Steven Koonin, Ph.D.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D.

Roy Spencer, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

FOREWORD: SECRETARY CHRIS WRIGHT	5
FOREWORD: CSAG	6
PART I: DIRECT HUMAN INFLUENCE ON ECOSYSTEMS AND THE CLIMATE	7
1. CARBON DIOXIDE AS DISTINCT FROM CRITERIA AIR CONTAMINANTS	8
2. CO₂ FERTILIZATION AND GLOBAL GREENING	9
2.1. CO ₂ AND GLOBAL GREENING	9
2.2. PHOTOSYNTHESIS AND CO ₂ LEVELS	10
2.3. RISING CO ₂ AND CROP WATER USE EFFICIENCY	12
2.4. CONCEALMENT OF CO ₂ FERTILIZATION BENEFITS IN IPCC REPORTS	13
3. INCREASING CO₂ AND THE ALKALINE OCEANS	15
4. HUMAN INFLUENCES ON THE CLIMATE.....	17
4.1. COMPONENTS OF RADIATIVE FORCING AND THEIR HISTORY	17
4.2. FUTURE EMISSION SCENARIOS AND THE CARBON CYCLE.....	20
4.3. AEROSOLS AND THE UNCERTAINTIES ASSOCIATED WITH THEM	24
PART II: CLIMATE RESPONSE TO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	28
5. CLIMATE SENSITIVITY TO CO₂ FORCING	29
5.1. INTRODUCTION	29
5.2. MODEL-BASED METHODS OF COMPUTING CLIMATE SENSITIVITY TO GHGs.....	29
5.3. DATA-DRIVEN METHODS OF COMPUTING CLIMATE SENSITIVITY TO GHGs	30
5.4. TRANSIENT CLIMATE RESPONSE.....	32
5.5. SUMMARY	33
6. MODELS VERSUS OBSERVATIONS IN THE RECENT PAST	36
6.1. INTRODUCTION	36
6.2. SURFACE WARMING	36
6.3. TROPOSPHERIC WARMING	38
6.4. VERTICAL PROFILE MISMATCH AND EXCESS AMPLIFICATION	42
6.5. STRATOSPHERIC COOLING	46
6.6. WATER VAPOUR TRENDS	46
6.7. SNOW COVER	47
6.8. US CORN BELT	48
7. UNCERTAINTIES IN CLIMATE CHANGE ATTRIBUTION.....	51
7.1. INTRODUCTION	51
7.2. NATURAL CLIMATE VARIABILITY	53
7.3. OPTIMAL FINGERPRINTING	56
7.4. TIME SERIES METHODS.....	57
7.5. EXTREME EVENT ATTRIBUTION (EEA).....	58
7.6. CASE STUDY – 2021 WESTERN NORTH AMERICA HEAT WAVE	60
7.7. SUMMARY	61
8. EXTREME WEATHER IN THE US AND ELSEWHERE.....	68

8.1.	INTRODUCTION	68
8.2.	REVIEW OF IPCC AND NCA FINDINGS ON EXTREME WEATHER	69
8.3.	EXTREME WEATHER TRENDS AT GLOBAL AND CONTINENTAL SCALE	84
8.4.	TEMPERATURE AND PRECIPITATION EXTREMES IN THE CONTIGUOUS US (CONUS)	90
9.	CHANGES IN SEA LEVEL.....	105
9.1.	U.S. COASTAL SEA LEVEL RISE	105
9.2.	SEA LEVEL RISE PROJECTIONS	109
9.3.	SUMMARY	110
	PART III: IMPACTS ON ECOSYSTEMS AND SOCIETY	111
10.	CLIMATE CHANGE AND US AGRICULTURE.....	112
10.1.	ECONOMETRIC ANALYSES.....	112
10.2.	FIELD STUDIES OF CO ₂ ENRICHMENT	113
10.3.	CROP MODELING META-ANALYSES.....	115
11.	MANAGING RISKS OF EXTREME WEATHER	118
11.1.	SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXT	118
11.2.	DATA CHALLENGES	118
12.	MORTALITY FROM TEMPERATURE EXTREMES	120
12.1.	HEAT AND COLD RISKS.....	120
12.2.	THE IMPORTANCE OF ADAPTATION.....	122
12.3.	MORTALITY RISKS AND ENERGY COSTS	122
13.	CLIMATE CHANGE, THE ECONOMY AND THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON.....	124
13.1.	CLIMATE CHANGE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH	124
13.2.	MODELS OF THE SOCIAL COST OF CARBON	128
13.3.	SUMMARY	132
14.	U.S. VEHICLE-BASED CO₂ EMISSIONS AND THE GLOBAL CLIMATE	135
15.	REFERENCES	136
16.	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	143
17.	ABOUT THE AUTHORS	146

Foreword: Secretary Chris Wright

Foreword: CSAG

This document originated in late March 2025 when Secretary Wright assembled an independent team to write a report on issues in climate science relevant for energy policymaking, with particular focus on the question of whether carbon dioxide emissions endanger the US public. The team agreed to undertake the work on the condition that there would be no editorial oversight by the Secretary, the Department of Energy, or any other government personnel. This condition has been honored throughout the process and the writing team has worked with full independence.

The team began working in early April with a deadline of May 28. The short timeline and the technical nature of the material meant that we could not comprehensively review all topics. While the report is intended to be accessible for non-experts, we have omitted some introductory or explanatory material that can easily be accessed elsewhere. Nor have we attempted to survey entire literatures related to the topics covered. The scientific and technical material herein only samples vast literature on climate change but is, we believe, more than sufficient to establish our conclusions.

The team writing this report was not involved in, nor briefed on, any Administration plans or processes related to a potential challenge to the 2009 EPA CO₂ Endangerment Finding. We were asked, however, to include some information related to the role of US motor vehicles in global climate change, since that is an issue of relevance to the Department of Energy.

The writing team is grateful to Secretary Wright for the opportunity to prepare this report and for his support for independent scientific inquiry.

Part I: Direct Human Influence on Ecosystems and the Climate

1. Carbon dioxide as distinct from criteria air contaminants

This report is chiefly concerned with carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from fossil fuel use. Although it has become common to refer to CO₂ as “pollution” this is a misnomer. In the framework of United States clean air policy there are six types of so-called Criteria Air Contaminants (EPA, undated): particulate matter, ground-level ozone, Sulfur Dioxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, Lead and carbon monoxide (CO). Air contaminants are subject to regulatory control because they cause local problems depending on concentrations that include nuisances (odor, visibility problems), damage to plants and, at high enough exposure levels, toxicological effects in humans.

CO₂ has not historically been viewed as an air pollutant in the US or elsewhere because it is odorless, does not affect visibility and has no toxicological effects at ambient levels. It is a naturally-occurring part of the atmosphere and a key component of human and plant respiration. CO₂ is essential for plant photosynthesis and higher levels are generally considered beneficial for vegetation, as will be discussed in this report.

Ambient outdoor air contains about 420 parts per million (ppm) CO₂. The US Occupational Safety and Health Administration issues guidelines for indoor workplaces in which elevated CO₂ may be encountered, such as where dry ice is used. The Permissible Exposure Limit is 5,000 ppm over 8 hours (OSHA 2024). Allen et al. (2015) reported evidence of diminished performance on some cognitive tasks among workers in office cubicles when exposed to CO₂ levels above 1,000-1,500 ppm.

The main concern about CO₂ is its potential effects on the global climate. This is a very complex question which will occupy much of this report. We will begin in the next section by looking at the role of CO₂ in promoting global greening and agricultural productivity growth, then we will examine the effect of CO₂ on ocean alkalinity. We then turn to CO₂'s role as a so-called greenhouse gas (GHG), beginning with a brief description of radiative forcing, the carbon cycle and the role of aerosols. Part II of this report discusses in detail the topic of the climatic response to GHGs. Part III discusses some aspects of the impacts of climate change on ecosystems and society.

US Environmental Protection Agency (Undated) Criteria Air Pollutants. <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants> accessed April 29 2025.

US Occupational Health and Safety Administration (2024) “OSHA Occupational Chemical Database: Carbon Dioxide” <https://www.osha.gov/chemicaldata/183>

Allen, Joseph G, Piers MacNaughton, Usha Satish, Suresh Santanam, Jose Vallarino and John D.S. Spengler (2015) Associations of Cognitive Function Scores with Carbon Dioxide, Ventilation, and Volatile Organic Compound Exposures in Office Workers: A Controlled Exposure Study of Green and Conventional

2. CO₂ fertilization and global greening

2.1. CO₂ and global greening

“Greening” refers to an increase in the total amount of the Earth’s surface covered in plants. The main measure of greening is “Leaf Area Index” or LAI as measured by satellite. Many studies over the past decade have confirmed a global greening pattern (rising LAI) attributable to rising CO₂ levels. Zhu et al. (2016) was one of the first studies to report that global greening was detectable from space using satellite sensors. On data spanning 1982 to 2011 they detected greening over 25-50% of the Earth versus browning over only 4%, and they attributed 70% of the greening to rising CO₂ levels (see Figure 2.3).




Figure 2.1.1: Trends in average Leaf Area Index (LAI). Source: Zhu et al. 2016 Figure 3.

Zheng (2017) confirmed the pattern, noting that greening over 30 years had added 8% to global leaf area and that greening was mitigating warming. Greening has been observed globally but Chen et al. (2019) noted that China and India were taking particular advantage of it though land management changes.

Thus while China accounts for only 6.6% of global vegetated area it accounts for 25% of global net increase in LAI. Piao et al. (2020) noted that greening was even observable in the Arctic.

While plant models predict increases in photosynthesis should be observed in response to rising CO₂, Haverd et al. (2020) reported that observed CO₂ fertilization rate was nearly double what models had predicted. That is, CO₂ fertilization had driven an increase in observed global photosynthesis by 30% since 1900, versus 17% predicted by plant models. Among other things this indicates that global models of the socioeconomic impacts of climate change have likely understated the benefits to crops and agriculture from rising CO₂. The connection between CO₂ fertilization and climate policy will be discussed in Chapter XX.

Finally, Chen et al. surveyed claims that greening had slowed down since 2000 due to drought stress. They found instead that claims of slowed greening could be attributed to faulty satellite sensors. Once the data were corrected they found greening was accelerating over 55% of the world while browning was accelerating over only 7% of the world. Overall the greening trend was continuing with no evidence of slowdown, and CO₂ fertilization remained the dominant driver

2.2. Photosynthesis and CO₂ levels

A key direct effect of adding CO₂ to the atmosphere is its positive effect on plant life via enhancement of photosynthesis and improvement to plant water use efficiency.

The term *photosynthesis* describes the process by which plants build biomass. The process requires carbon dioxide (CO₂), water (H₂O), and light. The plant enzyme responsible for photosynthesis is called Ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate-carboxylase/oxygenase or “Rubisco”. Photosynthesis is initiated when CO₂ is available at the surface of the RuBisCo enzyme where it is converted to a molecule with 3 carbon atoms and thereafter incorporated into plant mass, which is referred to as the C3 process.

Rubisco is estimated to have evolved about 3 billion years ago. Over geological time the Earth’s atmospheric CO₂ levels were usually much higher than they are today. About 400 million years ago CO₂ levels were an estimated 2,000-4,000 ppm and were at or above 1,000 ppm for much of the interval from 200 to 50 million years ago (Berner 2006, Judd et al. 2024). Over the past 35 million years the level of atmospheric CO₂ has been steadily declining. During glaciations levels have fallen as low as 170 ppm (Gerhart and Ward 2010). In response to low-CO₂ conditions some plants evolved another photosynthetic pathway called C4, in which CO₂ is concentrated in the vicinity of Rubisco allowing for the C3 process to function more efficiently. For agricultural purposes the plant categories are:

- C3: rice, wheat, soybeans and most other crops
- C4: maize (corn), sugar cane, millet, sorghum

Had atmospheric CO₂ levels continued declining, plant growth rates would have declined and eventually ceased. Below 180 ppm many C3 species experience growth rate reductions on the order of 40-60% compared to their growth rates at 350 ppm (Gerhart and Ward 2010). C3 plants have been observed under experimental conditions to stop growing altogether at levels between 60—140 ppm CO₂. Some C4 plants are still able to grow at levels even as low as 10 ppm, albeit very slowly (Gerhart and Ward 2010).

Currently, CO₂ levels are about 420 ppm, up from 280 ppm in the early 1800s. The positive response of plants to extra CO₂ is illustrated in Figure 1 which is reproduced from Gerhart and Ward (2010). It shows the growth effect of CO₂ on Velvetleaf (*Abutilon theophrasti*) seedlings over 14 days under controlled conditions where only the CO₂ exposure is varied. The gains exhibited from increasing CO₂ from 150 ppm to 350 ppm continue under a further doubling to 700 ppm.




Figure 2.2.1: growth of *Abutilon theophrasti* after 14 days under identical conditions but for the indicated variations in CO₂ levels. Source: Gerhart and Ward (2010).

Over the past 60+ years there have been tens of thousands of studies on the response of plants to rising CO₂ levels. The overwhelming theme is that plants, especially C3 plants, benefit from extra CO₂. There are two mechanisms by which CO₂ confers a growth benefit:

- Enhanced photosynthesis via the metabolic pathways described above.
- Increased water use efficiency. This arises because plants draw in CO₂ by opening the stomata (pores) on the leaf surface. When CO₂ is scarce the stomata must be kept wide open for long periods, which allows water to evaporate away. Under enriched CO₂ conditions the stomata are closed for longer periods helping the plant retain water longer, thereby increasing water use efficiency.

Specific effects of climate change on US agriculture will be reviewed in Chapter XX.

2.3. Rising CO₂ and crop water use efficiency

Deryng et al. (2016) surveyed evidence on crop water productivity (CWP), i.e. yield per unit of water used, drawing attention to the potential for CO₂ both to enhance photosynthesis and reduce leaf-level transpiration (water loss during leaf respiration). They surveyed all available FACE data on crop yield changes for Maize (corn), Wheat, Rice and Soybean, and combined it with crop model data simulating yield responses as of 2080 under the extreme RCP8.5 scenario in four growing regions (Tropics, Arid, Temperate and Cold) each of which were split into rainfed and irrigated sub-regions. In every region they reported that models without CO₂ fertilization predicted CWP losses but CO₂ fertilization more than offset them and once it was taken into account all regions showed a net CWP gain. Deryng et al (2016) also reported that negative impacts of warming on wheat and soybean yields were fully offset by CWP gains, and mitigated by up to 90% for rice and 60% for maize.

Similar to this, Cheng et al. (2017) noted that increased global plant growth from 1982 to 2011 due to rising CO₂ uptake was accompanied by such large gains in CWP that despite the extra biomass global water use by plants had not increased.

Deryng et al. (2016) assumed that climate change would “exacerbate water scarcity”. It is noteworthy that while models predict drylands will expand under climate warming, current data show the opposite: greening is happening even in arid areas. Zhang et al. (2014) report that due to increased CO₂ levels “increasing aridity in drylands won’t lead to a general loss of vegetation productivity”; increased desertification will happen in at most 4% of currently arid areas.

2.4. Concealment of CO₂ fertilization benefits in IPCC Reports

If CO₂ emissions were discovered to be causing global crop declines and regional browning we would almost certainly have seen it discussed prominently in IPCC reports, and indeed it likely would have been the subject of its own chapter in an Assessment Report if not an IPCC Special Report. By contrast the IPCC has been almost silent on the topic of global greening.

The topic is briefly acknowledged in a few places in the body of the IPCC 6th and earlier Assessment Reports but is omitted in all Summary documents. Section 2.3.4.3.3 of the AR6 Working Group I report is titled “global greening and browning.” It points out that the IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land had concluded with high confidence that greening had increased globally over the past 2-3 decades. It then discusses the various estimate of greening trends, notes that there are variations in the estimates among data sets and then says that while they have *high confidence* greening has occurred, they have *low confidence* in the magnitude of the trend. There are also brief mentions of CO₂ fertilization effects and improvements in water use efficiency in a few other chapters in the AR6 Working Groups I and II Reports.

Overall, however, the Policymaker Summaries, Technical Summaries and Synthesis Reports are conspicuous for their failure to discuss the topic.

References

- Ainsworth, Elizabeth and Stephen P. Long (2020) 30 years of free-air carbon dioxide enrichment (FACE): What have we learned about future crop productivity and its potential for adaptation? *Global Change Biology* <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15375>
- Allen Jr, L. K. (2011). Elevated CO₂ increases water use efficiency by sustaining photosynthesis of water-limited maize and sorghum. *Journal of Plant physiology*, 168(16), 1909-1918.
- Berner, R.A. GEOCARBSULF: A combined model for Phanerozoic atmospheric O₂ and CO₂. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 70 (2006) 5653–5664.
- Blandino, M. B. (2020). Elevated CO₂ impact on common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) yield, wholemeal quality, and sanitary risk. *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 68(39), 10574-10585.
- Chen, Chi et al. (2019) China and India lead in greening of the world through land-use management. *Nature sustainability* 2:122-129 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-019-0220-7>
- Chen, Xin et al. (2024) The global greening continues despite increased drought stress since 2000. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 49 e02791 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2351989423004262>

- Cheng, L., Zhang, L., Wang, YP. *et al.* Recent increases in terrestrial carbon uptake at little cost to the water cycle. *Nature Communications* **8**, 110 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00114-5>
- Deryng, Delphine and 15 coauthors (2016) Regional disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO₂ concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nature Climate Change* 18 April 2016 DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2995.
- Gerhart, Laci and Joy Ward (2010) Plant responses to low [CO₂] of the past. *New Phytologist* 188:674—695. <https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03441.x>
- Haverd, Vanessa et al. (2020) Higher than expected CO₂ fertilization inferred from leaf to global observations. *Global Change Biology* 26: 2390–2402.
- Hu, S. W. (2021). Response of rice yield traits to elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and its interaction with cultivar, nitrogen application rate and temperature: a meta-analysis of 20 years FACE studies. *Science of the Total Environment*, 764, 142797.
- Judd, Emily et al. (2024) A 485-million-year history of Earth’s surface temperature. *Science* 385 Issue 6715 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adk3705>
- Lee, Y. S. (2020). The effect of concurrent elevation in CO₂ and temperature on the growth, photosynthesis, and yield of potato crops. *PLoS One*, 15(10), e0241081.
- Li, D. L. (2013). Effects of elevated CO₂ on the growth, seed yield, and water use efficiency of soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) under drought stress. *Agricultural Water Management*, 129, 105-112.
- Lv, C. H. (2020). Response of rice yield and yield components to elevated [CO₂]: a synthesis of updated data from FACE experiments. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 112, 125961.
- Piao Shilong et al. (2020) Characteristics, drivers and feedbacks of global greening *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* 1:14-27
- Verhage, F. Y. (2017, November). Carbon dioxide fertilization offsets negative impacts of climate change on Arabica coffee yield in Brazil. Retrieved October 2024, from esalq: http://www.esalq.usp.br/departamentos/leeb/eventos/Thesis_Report_-_Fabian_Verhage.pdf
- Zeng, Zhenzhong et al. (2017) Climate mitigation from vegetation biophysical feedbacks during the past three decades. *Nature Climate Change* 7:432-436 May 2017 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3299>
- Zhang et al. (2024) Less than 4% of dryland areas are projected to desertify despite increased aridity under climate change. *Nature Communications Earth and Environment* 5 June 2024 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01463-y>
- Zhu, Zaichun et al. (2016) Greening of the Earth and its drivers. *Nature Climate Change* 6 Aug 2016 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate3004>

3. Increasing CO₂ and the Alkaline Oceans

The modern-day global average pH of sea water is estimated to be 8.1, down from an estimated value of 8.2 in pre-Industrial times (Gattuso and Hansson, 2011). As CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere increase, more is absorbed by the oceans. Depending upon the alkalinity (buffering capacity) of the oceans, the oceans are expected to become somewhat less alkaline over time, putatively explaining the decrease in pH from 8.2 to 8.1 over the last few hundred years.

While this process is often called “ocean acidification”, this is a misnomer because the oceans are not expected to become acidic (pH less than 7.0). Even if that was to happen, it is believed that life in the oceans evolved during a period when the oceans were mildly acidic, with a pH of 6.5 to 7.0 (Krissansen-Totton et al., 2018).

For many years it was assumed that a decreasing pH of sea water would reduce the calcification rate of coral reefs. But coral reefs already endure large swings in pH, partly due to daily photosynthetic activity in the reef. This results in pH values that have been measured to range from 9.4 during the day to 7.5 at night (Revelle and Fairbridge, 1957).

In 2009 it was reported that a portion of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef (GBR, the world’s largest coral reef ecosystem) had experienced a 14% decline in calcification since 1990 (De’ath et al., 2009). This was tentatively attributed to increasing water temperature and decreasing pH of seawater. But since that time, the initial 2009 report of reduced calcification rates in the GBR was reported to have been the result of a bias in the data analysis (Ridd et al., 2013), and correction for this bias led to no change in calculated calcification rates. Nevertheless, the alarm produced by the original paper has persisted as evidenced by the large number of published citations (541) received by the original study as compared to only 11 citations for the subsequent study (as of 30 April 2025).

Given the reported declines in GBR coverage between 1990 and 2009, it has come as a surprise that the decline reversed over the last decade or so, with Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution asking, “Is the Great Barrier Reef Making a Comeback?” (Woods Hole, 2023). The most recent annual summary of GBR conditions from the Australian Institute of Marine Science was titled, Continued Coral Recovery Leads to 36-year Highs across Two-Thirds of the Great Barrier Reef (AIMS, 2022). Much of the decline in the GBR before 2011 turned out to be due to intense tropical cyclone activity (Beeden et al., 2015), and recovery of the reef from storm damage takes years.

On the time scale of thousands of years, boron isotope proxy measurements of pH show that ocean pH was around 7.4 or 7.5 during the last Ice Age (up to about 20,000 years ago) increasing to present-day values when the world warmed during deglaciation (Rae et al., 2018). Thus, there appears to be considerable resilience of ocean biota to natural long-term changes in ocean pH since marine organisms are exposed to wide ranges in pH anyway.

It is being increasingly recognized that publication bias (alarming ocean acidification results preferred by high-impact research publications) leads to exaggerated impacts from more alkaline oceans. An ICES Journal of Marine Science Special Issue addressed this problem with an article entitled, Towards a Broader Perspective on Ocean Acidification Research. In the Introduction to that Special Issue, H. I. Browman stated, “As is true across all of science, studies that report no effect of ocean acidification are typically more difficult to publish.” (Browman, 2016)

Similarly, a meta-analysis of the negative effects of ocean acidification on reef fishes found that initially dramatic conclusions published in the scientific literature were all but refuted upon subsequent analysis involving larger sample sizes of data (Clements et al., 2021).

In conclusion, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the effect of ocean “acidification” on marine biota has likely been exaggerated.

References

- Australian Institute of Marine Science (2022). Continued Coral Recovery Leads to 36-year Highs across Two-Thirds of the Great Barrier Reef. https://www.aims.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-08/AIMS_LTMP_Report_on%20GBR_coral_status_2021_2022_040822F3.pdf
- Beeden, R., Maynard, J., Puotinen, M., Marshall, P., Dryden, J., Goldberg, J., and Williams, G. (2015). Impacts and Recovery from Severe Tropical Cyclone Yasi on the Great Barrier Reef. *PLOS ONE*. 10. e0121272. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121272>
- Browman, H. (2016). Applying organized scepticism to ocean acidification research. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*. 73. 529.1-536. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw010>
- Clements, J., Sundin, J., Clark, T., Jutfelt, F. (2021). Meta-analysis reveals an extreme “decline effect” in the impacts of ocean acidification on fish behaviour. <https://doi.org/10.32942/osf.io/k9dbv>
- De'ath, G., Lough, J., and Fabricius, K. (2009). Declining Coral Calcification on the Great Barrier Reef. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*. 323. 116-9. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165283>
- Gattuso, J. P. and Hansson, L. (2011). Ocean acidification: background and history *Ocean Acidification* ed J P Gattuso and L Hansson (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Krissansen-Totton, J., Arney, G., and Catling, D. (2018). Constraining the climate and ocean pH of the early Earth with a geological carbon cycle model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 115. 201721296. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721296115>
- Rae, J. & Burke, Andrea & Robinson, L. & Adkins, Jess & Chen, T. & Cole, C. & Greenop, R. & Li 李涛, Tao & Littley, E. & Nita, Dan & Stewart, J. & Taylor, B.. (2018). CO2 storage and release in the deep Southern Ocean on millennial to centennial timescales. *Nature*. 562. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0614-0>
- Revelle, R. R. and R. Fairbridge (1957). Carbonate and carbon dioxide, in *Treatise on Marine. Ecology and Paleoecology*, Vol. 1: J. W. Hedgpeth, ed.
- Ridd, Peter & Silva, Eduardo & Stieglitz, Thomas. (2013). Have coral calcification rates slowed in the last twenty years?. *Marine Geology*. 346. 392–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2013.09.002>
- Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (2023). Is the Great Barrier Reef Making a Comeback? <https://www.whoi.edu/oceanus/feature/is-the-great-barrier-reef-making-a-comeback/>

4. Human influences on the climate

4.1. Components of radiative forcing and their history

Historical radiative forcing

A changing climate has been the norm throughout the Earth's 4.6-billion-year history. The Earth's temperature and weather patterns change naturally over timescales ranging from decades to millions of years. Natural variations in the surface climate originate in two ways. Internal climate fluctuations associated with circulations in the atmosphere and ocean produce exchanges of energy, water, and carbon between the atmosphere, oceans, land, and ice. External influences on the climate system include variations in the energy received from the sun and the effects of volcanic eruptions. Human activities influence climate through changing land use and land cover. Humans are also changing the composition of the atmosphere by increasing emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases and by altering the concentrations of aerosol particles in the atmosphere.

The earth is warmed by the sunlight it absorbs and cooled by the radiative heat it emits to outer space. Averaged over Earth, each of these processes involve power flows of about 240 Watts per square meter (W/m²). When they are in balance, there are no net external causes of warming or cooling. Human (and some natural) influences on the climate alter this balance and so cause the climate to change.

Influences on the energy balance are quantified by "radiative forcing", the extent to which they disturb the warming/cooling balance; a positive forcing warms while a negative forcing cools. The IPCC's estimated history of major components of radiative forcing since 1750 is shown in the following two figures from the IPCC AR6.




Figure 4.1.1: IPCC estimates of radiative forcing components over time. Source: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/figures/chapter-2/figure-2-10/>




Figure 4.1.2 IPCC estimates of radiative forcing component changes from 1750 to 2019. Source: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/figures/chapter-7/figure-7-6/>

These graphs show that the total radiative forcing is comprised of natural and anthropogenic components. Carbon dioxide is the largest human influence on the climate and the one most relevant to the effects of energy-using systems like motor vehicles. It exerts a warming influence by decreasing the cooling power of the atmosphere. Emissions of CO₂ are accumulating in the atmosphere, as described in the following section, so that the warming influence is increasing. Other greenhouse gases (methane, nitrous oxide, halogens, and ozone), which act similarly, currently add another 75% to CO₂'s warming. Aerosols exert a cooling effect, although with large uncertainties in the way they catalyze the formation of reflective clouds. As a result, understanding of the causes of recent warming requires not just identifying the warming effects of CO₂, but also the more uncertain cooling effects of sulfate aerosols.

The IPCC views the role of the sun as negligible, based on their preference for reconstructions that imply minimal solar change since preindustrial times. Connolly *et al.* (2021) reviewed sixteen different Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) reconstructions in the literature covering the 1600-2000 interval; they vary from almost no change in TSI to a relatively large upward trend. Connolly *et al.* point out that the variation in TSI reconstructions combined with variations in surface temperature reconstructions implies pairings can be found that are consistent with either no or most 20th century warming being attributable to the sun. A particularly thorny issue is the gap in the TSI data between 1989 and 1991 due to a delay in the launch of a monitor after the Space Shuttle Challenger disaster on January 28 1986, which prevented a replacement satellite from being launched in time to overlap with, and its readings to be intercalibrated with, the prior system (Zacharias 2014, Scafetta et al. 2019). The question of whether there is an upward trend in TSI over 1978 to 2018 comes down to how the missing data in that gap are filled.

The other natural forcing component is largely volcanic aerosols, which exert an episodic cooling influence.

The anthropogenic forcing component was negligible before about 1900 and has increased steadily since, rising to almost 3 W/m² today. However, this is still only about 1 percent of the unperturbed radiation flows, making it a challenge to isolate the effects of anthropogenic forcing since state-of-the-art satellite estimates of global radiative energy flows are only accurate to a few W/m². Natural sources of

global energy imbalance other than volcanoes are not included in these graphs because they remain largely unknown.

Future radiative forcing

Carbon dioxide's warming influence depends upon how much "extra" CO₂ accumulates in the atmosphere- i.e., its concentration. The CO₂ level as recorded at the Mauna Loa observatory in Hawaii is generally used as the representative global average concentration. The data are available online at <https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/index.html>. The concentration was about 316 ppm at the start of the record in 1959 and is now about 425 ppm, a 34 percent increase.




Fig. 4.1.3 Yearly average atmospheric CO₂ concentrations (1959-2024) measured at Mauna Loa, HI (green) compared to the estimated pre-Industrial CO₂ concentration of 280 ppm, and the estimated minimum levels required to sustain life on Earth (150 to 200 ppm). Need source

The annual increase in concentration is only about half of the CO₂ emitted because land and ocean processes absorb "excess" CO₂ at a rate approximately 50% of human emissions. Thus, future concentrations, and hence future human influences on the climate, depend upon two components: (1) future rates of global human CO₂ emissions, and (2) how fast the land and ocean remove extra CO₂ from the atmosphere. We discuss each of these in turn.

4.2. Future emission scenarios and the carbon cycle

Emission scenarios

Assessing the future dangers of GHG emissions requires assumptions about what those emissions will be. Future emissions, and hence human influences on the climate, will depend upon future demographics, economic progress, regulation, and the energy and agricultural technologies in use. Various assumptions about each of those lead to projections of greenhouse gas emissions and concentrations, aerosol concentrations, and changes in land use, which ultimately can be combined into assumptions about anthropogenic radiative forcing.

Because of the great uncertainties about these many factors in the decades to come, instead of making precise predictions of future concentrations, the IPCC has created various sets of scenarios meant to span a plausible range of possibilities for population, economy, technology, and so on. Recent versions of the scenarios are labeled by a number indicating the anthropogenic radiative forcing expected in 2100 under that scenario. Thus, a scenario labeled with a “6” corresponds to 6 W/m² of human-induced radiative forcing (warming) at the end of the century. (Recall current anthropogenic radiative forcing is about 2.7 W/m².)

Although the IPCC does not put its emission scenarios forward as forecasts they are often treated as such. Comparisons of past scenario groups against observations shows a tendency for IPCC emission projections to overstate actual subsequent emissions. For the IPCC Third and Fourth Assessment Reports a set of emission projections from the *Special Report on Emission Scenarios* were used and hence were referred to as the SREP scenarios. McKittrick *et al.* (2012) showed that, when converted to per capita terms, the SREP scenario distribution was skewed upwards and incompatible with observed trends. McKittrick and Wood (2013) further showed that global energy market dynamics constrained global per capita CO₂ emissions to an extent not reflected in IPCC scenarios. The bias of the SRES scenarios was confirmed by the later analysis in Hausfather *et al.* (2019) who showed that observed atmospheric CO₂ concentrations tracked the low end of the SRES range.

For the Fifth Assessment Report the IPCC developed a new set of scenarios called the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). These were identified by a number representing the increase in forcing and were thus called RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP6.0 and RCP8.5. RCP2.6 (implying a radiative forcing in 2100 of 2.6 W/m²) projects a GHG concentration pathway leading to warming well below 2 C. At the other end of the scale RCP8.5 is an extreme outcome implying nearly 5 C warming just in this century.

RCP8.5 came to be referred to as the no-policy baseline, or “business-as-usual” scenario in both the academic literature and popular media. It was therefore used to generate the reference outcome supposedly representing the 21st century world in the absence of emission reduction policies. But RCP8.5 was intended as a low-probability high emissions scenario and its usage as a business-as-usual baseline has been criticized as grossly misleading.¹ Hausfather and Peters (2020) writing in a commentary in *Nature* magazine, pointed out that RCP8.5 was developed as an extreme worst-case, and its misuse as a “business as usual” baseline has resulted in a large number of misleading studies and media reporting:

¹ This extreme scenario is useful for modelers, since a large forcing generates a large response (warming) making it easier to assess a model’s sensitivity. But that’s very different than claiming it is a plausible future.

RCP8.5 was intended to explore an unlikely high-risk future. But it has been widely used by some experts, policymakers and the media as something else entirely: as a likely ‘business as usual’ outcome. A sizeable portion of the literature on climate impacts refers to RCP8.5 as business as usual, implying that it is probable in the absence of stringent climate mitigation. The media then often amplifies this message, sometimes without communicating the nuances. This results in further confusion regarding probable emissions outcomes, because many climate researchers are not familiar with the details of these scenarios in the energy-modelling literature. (Hausfather and Peters 2020)

The implausibility of the RCP8.5 scenario was examined by Burgess *et al.* (2021). They noted that RCP8.5 has already diverged from observed energy use trends, and the near future trends diverge sharply from those of the International Energy Agency (IEA) which provides market-based projections of energy use for coming decades. IEA trends are based on plausible extrapolations of current economic and demographic trends, and the results run below the entire envelope of RCP projections, implying not only that RCP8.5 is dubious, but even lower emission scenarios are looking unlikely. Burgess *et al.* comment (p. 8):

Beyond 2040, if the trends anticipated by energy agency forecasts continue, carbon intensity will continue diverging from AR5 and SSP baselines—especially from higher-emission scenarios such as RCP8.5, due to the assumptions about fossil-fuel expansion in these scenarios that are increasingly implausible.

Widespread use of RCP8.5 has created an alarmist bias in the climate impacts literature. The extent of this problem was confirmed in a literature analysis by Pielke Jr. and Ritchie (2020). They found (p. 32) that some 16,800 scientific papers published between 2010 and 2020 used the RCP8.5 scenario, with about 4,500 of the articles (p. 16) linking RCP8.5 with the concept of “business-as-usual”. Their analysis showed how RCP8.5 was misused not only by individual researchers, but also by influential science agencies like the IPCC and the US National Climate Assessment (USNCA), which has directly led to misleading coverage in prominent media outlets. They offer the following example (p. 30):

The USNCA employed RCP8.5 as a baseline scenario, despite warning against such use, and compared it to RCP4.5 throughout its report to generate quantitative economic estimates of the benefits of mitigation. In a front-page story, the *New York Times* promoted the report’s misuse of RCP8.5 as a baseline scenario:

“A major scientific report issued by 13 federal agencies on Friday presents the starkest warnings to date of the consequences of climate change for the United States, predicting that if significant steps are not taken to rein in global warming, the damage will knock as much as 10 percent off the size of the American economy by century’s end.”

Pielke and Ritchie (2020) reported new studies using RCP8.5 were appearing in the literature at a rate of about 20 per day, with about two per day specifically linking RCP8.5 and “business as usual.” They conclude (p. 34) that the climate research community has spent a decade “committing scientific resources to science fiction” (emphasis added):

“Derived estimates from RCP8.5 as “business as usual” such as future climate impacts, the impacts avoided from mitigation and the cost effectiveness and benefits of mitigation have no real-world meaning... **The scientific literature has become imbalanced in an apocalyptic direction.**

(Pielke Jr. and Ritchie p. 34)

The IPCC later converted the RCP scenarios to the “Shared Socioeconomic Pathway” or SSP scenarios, but these have continued the pattern of bias shown with the RCP and SRES scenarios. Figure 3.1.4 was generated using the Resources for the Future Global Energy Outlook tool (RFF 2025). The black line shows total global observed CO₂ emissions compiled by the International Energy Agency (IEA). The solid green line is the emission trajectory developed by BP Energy taking account of current emission control policies and global energy use outlooks. It overlaps a solid black line which represents the emission projection from the IEA also taking account of energy use projections and current policies. The dashed lines show the range of IPCC SSP policies. As of 2023 global CO₂ emissions have been tracking well below the SSP scenarios especially the two highest ones (SSP5-8.5 and SSP3-7.0).

Carbon dioxide emissions (Million metric tons), by Outlooks & Scenarios. Filtered by Region: World; Fuel: All; Outlook: 2023 Shell (Sky 2050).

Source: RFF Global Energy Outlook at www.rff.org/glo




Figure 4.2.1. Observed and projected CO₂ emissions. Source: RFF (2025).

The carbon cycle relating emissions and concentrations

Global carbon cycle models relate concentrations to emissions using estimates of various land and ocean processes that remove CO₂ from, and emit CO₂ into, the atmosphere. Our understanding of these processes was reviewed by Crisp et al. (2021). The natural fluxes of CO₂ in and out of the Earth’s surface are very large, many times anthropogenic emissions, but those CO₂ sources and sinks were assumed to be in approximate balance in pre-Industrial times, as evidenced by relatively constant levels of

atmospheric CO₂ in centuries past derived from air bubbles in ice cores. This is one of several reasons why increasing atmospheric CO₂ levels are believed to be dominated by anthropogenic sources.

Specifically, fossil fuel burning (and to a lesser extent land use [biomass burning] and cement production) has led to steadily increasing CO₂ levels in the atmosphere, as shown in Fig. 1.2.1. CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel burning is a small fraction of the natural carbon cycle components. About 44,000 Gigatonnes of carbon-equivalent (GtC) are stored in the atmosphere and oceans, mostly in the form of CO₂. (Ciais et al. 2013). Between 150 and 200 GtC are released naturally each year through oceanic outgassing and land-based processes like plant decay and animal respiration. A variable but roughly equivalent amount is absorbed each year by the land and oceans, with a small net loss from the atmosphere because the formation of deep ocean sediment sequesters some carbon permanently. Global fossil fuel consumption and cement manufacture released about 10.3 GtC in 2023, up from 6.2 GtC in 1990 (Ritchie et al. 2024). Of this, about half is naturally sequestered through plant growth and oceanic uptake while the remainder, about half, adds to the atmospheric stock (Ciais et al. 2013).

As noted, each year natural processes remove a net amount of CO₂ equivalent to about 50% of global emissions. Thus, anthropogenic CO₂ emissions average twice what is required to explain the atmospheric rise in CO₂ concentration. The near-constancy of that 50% fraction (the “airborne fraction”) also means that the more CO₂ humanity produces, the faster nature removes it from the atmosphere. That 50% fraction changes somewhat from year to year due to natural carbon cycle imbalances from El Nino, La Nina, and varying weather patterns. There was also a substantial additional reduction in atmospheric CO₂ after the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo, a curious result that has yet to be explained (Angert et al., 2004).

The main processes which remove excess CO₂ from the atmosphere are increased production of land vegetation (especially at high latitudes), some increase in the sequestering of carbon in soils, and uptake of CO₂ by the ocean due to the increasing partial pressure of atmospheric CO₂ over that of CO₂ dissolved in the ocean. All twenty land carbon cycle models tracked by the Global Carbon Project (Friedlingstein et al., 2024) show land processes have been removing excess CO₂ at an increasing rate since 1959. This is consistent with a “global greening” phenomenon observed by satellites since monitoring of global greenness began in the 1982. This greening has been traced to CO₂ fertilization and greater drought tolerance of plants exposed to elevated CO₂ levels. While there had been some uncertainty whether a greening trend continued beyond 2000, the most recent research (Chen et al., 2023) has shown continued greening, with even some slight acceleration since 2000. Global greening is discussed further in Section 3.1.

While land vegetation has been responding positively to more atmospheric CO₂, uptake of extra CO₂ by ocean biological processes remains too uncertain to be reliably measured. Our current understanding of these and many more carbon cycle processes was reviewed by Crisp et al. (2021).

Public policy can only change the rate of emissions, not the concentration in the atmosphere. For criteria air contaminants the rate and concentration are closely connected because the lifetime is short and the concentration is small. When emissions are reduced the local pollution concentration drops rapidly, usually on a time scale of a few days. Not so with the global average CO₂ concentration since global carbon cycle is vast and slow. A change in local emissions today will only have a very small global effect, and only after a long time lag. After a pulse (release) of CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere only about 40 percent ($\pm 15\%$) of the extra CO₂ will have been sequestered after twenty years. After a

thousand years about 75 percent ($\pm 10\%$) will have been sequestered, and the remainder will gradually be removed over the ensuing tens of thousands of years (Ciais et al. 2013, pp. 472-473). Consequently US CO₂ emission reductions will take decades or centuries to lead to a reduction in the global CO₂ concentration.

To reduce the atmospheric stock of CO₂, assuming the entire increase is anthropogenic, would require emissions to fall below the natural sequestration rate. Since that rate has been averaging about 50% of emissions, a reduction of global emissions by 50% would (at least temporarily) halt the rise in atmospheric CO₂. The 1997 Kyoto Protocol proposed to cap industrial nations' CO₂ emissions at a modest five percent below 1990 levels by the year 2012. Even though this policy ended up too costly for most nations to implement, full compliance would not have substantially reduced atmospheric CO₂ levels. It would only have slightly slowed CO₂ growth, reaching the projected 2100 level in 2105 instead (Wigley 1998). Similarly, Lomborg (2016) used the widely-used MAGICC climate model and showed that full compliance with the Paris Accord would not stop warming, it would only prevent about 0.1C warming and delay hitting the baseline year 2100 temperature levels by about a decade.

Thus, in contrast with conventional air pollution control, local actions yield extremely small local effects, and only after a long time lag. The practice of referring to unilateral US reductions as “combatting climate change” or “taking action on climate” reflects a profound misunderstanding of the scale of the issue. As will be discussed in Chapter 14, the scale problem is compounded by recognizing that US motor vehicles account only for about 4 percent of global CO₂ emissions so even a fifty percent reduction in those emissions would have a vanishingly small effect on the global climate.

4.3. Aerosols and the uncertainties associated with them

The climate's sensitivity to CO₂ (as quantified by ECS, the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity²) is uncertain because the net forcing results from (at least) two counteracting components: warming from GHG's and cooling from aerosols. The observed warming can therefore be made to be consistent with a wide range of pairs of these forces. In the following schematic, the net warming represented by the red arrow could be due to the High GHG warming/strong aerosol cooling pair, or the Low GHG warming/weak aerosol cooling pair, or something in between.

² ECS is formally defined as the increase in equilibrium global average surface temperature resulting from a doubling of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration above its pre-industrial value of 280 ppm. Estimates of ECS are reviewed in Section XX.




Figure 4.3.1: High and low climate sensitivity to GHGs can be reconciled with the same warming by assuming an offsetting aerosol cooling effect.

Research on the strength of aerosol cooling is therefore central to more precise ECS estimates. Lewis and Curry (2018) note that after the IPCC AR5 was published in 2013, eleven studies appeared in the scientific literature all finding that aerosol cooling was weaker than had previously been conjectured. Combining the updated aerosol estimates with greenhouse gas, ocean heat uptake and atmospheric warming data from the IPCC and applying standard empirical methods, Lewis and Curry (2018) estimated the best-guess ECS to be 1.66°C with a 95 percent uncertainty range of 1.15 °C – 2.7°C. They concluded that based on the ECS values derived from most IPCC climate models were incompatible with observed data.

There has been further evidence of lower aerosol cooling (implying lower ECS) such as Liu et al. (2021). These authors tested the hypothesis that aerosols from wildfires has increased since before the 20th century which, if true, would mean there had to have been relatively strong CO₂ warming over that period offsetting the aerosol cooling. They examined soot layers in ice cores extracted from Antarctica and South America and determined that wildfire activity prior to the 20th century was higher than previously believed. Instead of wildfire activity rising steadily from the 1700s to the present, it was high all the time, thus contradicting the hypothesized aerosol cooling trend in the Southern Hemisphere during the 20th century. They pointed out how this finding relates to the climate sensitivity issue:

Accurate estimates of aerosol radiative forcing are also crucial for better understanding the transient climate response (TCR) and equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS) to increasing CO₂ and more accurate projection of future climate change. The negative aerosol radiative forcing can, in part, cancel out the positive forcing of increasing greenhouse gases and contribute to the uncertainty of total radiative forcing. An overly large aerosol cooling implies that models might overestimate TCR and ECS to reproduce historical temperature response. A recent study using one of the latest-generation CMIP6 climate models (E3SM) suggested that reducing both the magnitudes of negative aerosol radiative forcing and climate sensitivity yields a better agreement with the observed historical record of the surface temperature.

(Liu et al. 2021)

More evidence pointing to weak aerosol cooling was reported by Wang *et al.* (2021). They noted that the strength of aerosol cooling is partly mediated by cloud behavior and differs between the North and South Hemispheres because of the different density of aerosol emissions. This allowed them to construct another test of climate model validity, which came out in favor of low ECS models. In their words:

Since anthropogenic aerosols primarily concentrate in the Northern Hemisphere, strong aerosol-cloud interaction models produce an interhemispheric asymmetric warming. We show that the observed warming asymmetry during the mid to late 20th century is more consistent with low ECS (weak aerosol indirect effect) models.

Wang et al. (2021)

To summarize, quantifying warming due to CO₂ requires understanding the strength of aerosol cooling. While that latter is uncertain a substantial body of recent evidence points to it being relatively weak, implying that CO₂ warming is likewise weak.

Summary

- The global climate is naturally variable. Anthropogenic CO₂ emissions add to that variability by changing the total radiative balance in the atmosphere.
- The IPCC has downplayed the role of the sun in climate change but there are Total Solar Irradiance reconstructions that imply it might have been important, and the modern record is uncertain due to an interruption in satellite coverage.
- Projections of anthropogenic emissions are combined with carbon cycle model estimates of atmospheric CO₂ removal to estimate future CO₂ concentrations and hence the radiative forcings. These are input to climate models to estimate future anthropogenic changes in the climate.
- IPCC emission scenarios envelopes have tended to exceed observed trends.
- The vast majority of academic climate “impacts” studies in recent years are based upon the extreme RCP8.5 scenario that is considered implausible; its usage as a business-as-usual scenario is misleading.
- Despite ample evidence that scenario envelopes are exaggerated, and despite criticism of this practice in the peer-reviewed literature, the IPCC’s most recent scenario set (SSP) perpetuates this malpractice.
- The global carbon cycle heavily dampens the effect of changes in local (e.g. U.S.) CO₂ emissions. Even global-scale emission reductions will have only small, much delayed effects.
- Knowing the magnitude of CO₂ warming requires knowing the strength of aerosol cooling. While that is uncertain, a substantial body of recent evidence points to it being relatively weak, implying CO₂ warming is likewise weak.

Scaffeta, Nicola, Richard C. Willson, Jae N. Lee and Dong Wu (2019) Modeling Quiet Solar Luminosity Variability from TSI Satellite Measurements and Proxy Models during 1980–2018. *Remote Sensing* 11(21) 2569 <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11212569>

Connolly, Roman, Willie Soon, Michael Connolly et al. (2021) How much has the Sun influenced Northern Hemisphere temperature trends? An ongoing debate *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 21(6) doi: 10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131>

Zacharias, Pia (2014) An Independent Review of Existing Total Solar Irradiance Records. *Surveys in Geophysics* 35 pp. 897—912 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10712-014-9294-y>

Liu, Pengfei et al. (2021) “Improved estimates of preindustrial biomass burning reduce the magnitude of aerosol climate forcing in the Southern Hemisphere” *Science Advances* 7(22) May 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc1379>

Wang, C., Soden, B. J., Yang, W., & Vecchi, G. A. (2021). Compensation between cloud feedback and aerosol-cloud interaction in CMIP6 models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48, e2020GL091024. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL091024>

Part II: Climate Response to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

5. Climate Sensitivity to CO₂ Forcing

5.1. Introduction

The sensitivity of Earth's climate to increasing concentrations of CO₂ is at the heart of the scientific debate on anthropogenic climate change, and also the public debate on the appropriate policy response to increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere. Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS) refers to the expected amount of warming averaged over the Earth's surface in response to a doubling of CO₂, after all climate systems have had time to adjust. Some systems, like temperatures in the troposphere, adjust very rapidly, whereas others such as the deep ocean and ice sheets may take decades or even centuries. A related metric which is helpful for analysis on shorter time scales is the Transient Climate Response (TCR), defined as the amount of warming after 70 years in which atmospheric CO₂ increases by one percent annually.

In 1979 the Charney (1979) Report for the US National Academy of Sciences proposed that the most likely value for ECS was 3.0°C plus or minus 1.5°C. The ECS range between 1.5 and 4.5°C is characterized by the IPCC AR5 as the likely range (66 percent probability); the AR5 stated that ECS is extremely unlikely (95 percent probability) to be below 1.0°C and very unlikely (90 percent probability) to exceed 6.5°C. This range of ECS values has remained stubbornly wide, despite many individual studies claiming to narrow it. Most recently, the IPCC AR6 narrowed its assessment of the likely range of ECS to 2.5–4.0°C and the very likely range to be between 2.0 and 5.0°C. This narrowing of the range on the low end is disputed, as will be discussed below.

Uncertainties about ECS are highly consequential for policy making. As will be discussed in Chapter 13, economic models take the ECS value from climate science and use it to project the costs of CO₂ emissions. The traditional ECS value (3.0 °C) has typically yielded modest global social costs of CO₂ emissions, enough to justify some policy actions though mostly deferred to later in the century. If ECS is very high (4.5°C or above) aggressive immediate emission controls become more imperative, whereas values closer to 2.0°C have been shown to imply that no CO₂ emission controls are economically justifiable (Dayaratna et al. 2016, 2020). Obtaining a precise estimate is impossible, so policy making needs to account for the uncertainty.

5.2. Model-based methods of computing climate sensitivity to GHGs

The ECS ranges for the IPCC AR4 and AR5 were obtained primarily by examining the behaviour of climate models. For the AR6 the IPCC changed course and turned to a more direct data-driven methodology. Here we discuss some of the pitfalls of using climate models to try to determine the Earth's climate sensitivity.

ECS represents an emergent property of climate models—that is, it is not directly parameterized or tuned. However, collections of parameterizations are often chosen to produce an expected value of climate sensitivity, particularly with regards to sub-grid-scale cloud processes. Otherwise plausible models and parameter selections have been discarded because of perceived conflict with this warming rate, or aversion to a model's climate sensitivity being outside an accepted range. For example,

Mauritsen and Roeckner (2020) state the following regarding their Max Planck Institute climate model (emphasis added):

“We have documented how we tuned the MPI-ESM1.2 global climate model to match the instrumental record of warming; an endeavor which has clearly been successful. Due to the historical order of events, the choice was to do this practically by targeting an ECS of about 3 K using cloud feedbacks, as opposed to tuning the aerosol forcing.”

In other words, the modelers chose an ECS value of 3°C and then tuned the cloud parameterizations to match their intended result.

Direct warming from CO₂ doubling is only about 1°C (Hall and Manabe 1997); further warming arises from climate feedbacks that are not explicitly resolved by the model but rely on parameterizations of physical processes. Higher values of ECS arise primarily from positive cloud feedbacks whose magnitude and even sign are very uncertain. Elements of cloud feedback include changes in the latitudinal distribution of clouds, changes in the distribution of cloud height (changes in low versus high clouds), changes to the phase of clouds (ice versus liquid), changes in cloud particle size (associated with changes in concentration and/or composition of aerosol particles), changes in the precipitation efficiency of clouds, and even changes in how clouds are distributed over the daily solar cycle (Curry and Webster, 1999). It is difficult for climate models to simulate any of these processes correctly owing to their small scale, let alone predict how they will change in the future. Further, cloud processes modulate the magnitudes of the water vapor, lapse rate, and the surface albedo feedbacks.

ECS can be determined from climate model simulations by doubling the concentration of CO₂ and allowing several centuries for the warming to equilibrate. To avoid the necessity of long simulations, “effective climate sensitivity” is commonly evaluated from a 150-year simulation in response to a sudden quadrupling of CO₂. The spread of ECS values from the CMIP5 climate models (used in the AR5) was 2.0–4.7°C; the spread has increased for the CMIP6 models (used in the AR6) to between 1.8 and 5.7°C (Chen et al, 2021). Far from the science being settled in relation to the response of the climate system to increasing greenhouse gas concentrations, insofar as it is represented by climate models, uncertainties appear to be growing. The main cause of the overall upward shift in ECS in CMIP6 relative to CMIP5 is a larger positive cloud feedback, driven by changes to the cloud parameterizations in many CMIP6 models (Zelinka et al., 2020)

Because of concerns about model tuning and the high sensitivity to cloud parameterizations, the IPCC AR6 (2021) did not rely on climate model simulations in their assessment of climate sensitivity, relying instead on other methods in its assessment instead, chiefly a recent empirical estimate.

5.3. Data-driven methods of computing climate sensitivity to GHGs

Climate sensitivity can also be estimated from instrumental records of surface temperatures and ocean heat content, combined with estimates of how climate forcings (e.g., greenhouse gases, solar, volcanoes,

aerosols) have changed in the past (Otto et al., 2013). Using this information, a simple empirical model called an Energy Balance Model can be estimated. It requires estimating a feedback parameter whose uncertainties are highly amplified in the resulting ECS (Roe and Baker, 2007).

The accuracy of the data-driven methods depends on the quality of the input data. Assumptions are needed about ocean heat storage, and the ocean data is inadequate. The greatest source of uncertainty is the amount and composition of aerosol particles and their interactions with cloud radiative properties (the so-called aerosol indirect effect). Climate models exhibit warming in response to GHGs but cooling in response to aerosols (Schwartz et al. 2007). Observed 20th century warming can be shown to be consistent either with low ECS and low aerosol cooling, or high ECS and high aerosol cooling. Since fossil fuel use adds both GHGs and aerosols to the atmosphere, both effects need to be estimated to isolate the warming effect of CO₂. Over time, the IPCC's estimate of the cooling effect of aerosols has declined (Lewis 2022).

Paleoclimate proxies are also used to evaluate the sensitivity of past climates, by comparing paleoclimate changes in the Earth's temperatures to estimates of changes in forcings. The two most informative periods are the last glacial maximum (around 20,000 years ago), which was about 3–7°C colder than today, and a mid-Pliocene period (roughly three million years ago), which was 1–3°C warmer than today. The limits on cooling during the last glacial maximum give the best single evidence that high values of climate sensitivity are unlikely. However, paleoclimate estimates are associated with very large uncertainties in the estimated temperatures and forcings. Further, estimates of climate sensitivity based on past climate states may not be representative of the current state of the climate system.

A recurring theme in the climate literature is that ECS estimates based on historical data are smaller than ECS estimates inferred from climate models (Sherwood and Forest 2024). About 15 estimates based on historical data appeared in the peer-reviewed literature between 2012 and 2024 yielding ECS best estimates between 1.0°C and 2.5°C, although critics have questioned some of the methods and the data quality. For the AR6, the IPCC placed primary weight on the results of Sherwood et al. (2020) that combined historical and paleoclimate proxies and yielded a best estimate of 3.1°C. Lewis (2022) raised a number of concerns about this result, including methodological errors, outdated input values, and use of subjective versus objective Bayesian priors in the analysis. Lewis' analysis found that climate sensitivity is estimated to be much lower and better constrained than in the Sherwood et al. analysis – median 2.2°C (1.8–2.7°C in the 17–83 percent likely range, and 1.6–3.2°C in the 5–95 percent very likely range). The IPCC AR6 estimated only a 5 percent probability that ECS was below 2.3°C, whereas Lewis estimated it to be over 50 percent. The most recent publications on the debate between Sherwood et al. and Lewis further defend their respective positions: Sherwood and Foster (2024) and Lewis (2025).

An interesting footnote is that in 1983, the US National Research Council conducted a follow-up study to the 1979 Charney Report, and referring to the estimated sensitivity range of 1.5°C to 4.5°C, said:

“The climate record of the past hundred years and our estimates of CO₂ changes over that period suggest that values in the lower half of this range are more probable.”

Nierenberg et al. (1983 p. 2)

Lewis' analysis likewise implies that climate sensitivity is likely in the lower half of the original 1979 Charney range.

A recent argument, which the IPCC AR6 emphasized, is that data-driven ECS estimates might understate the future warming response to GHGs based on a so-called “pattern effect” (Forster et al 2021). The tropical Pacific is believed to be highly influential on the overall efficiency with which the Earth's climate radiates heat to space, but in some regions heat is more efficiently removed from the climate system than from others. If in a warming climate there is a weakening of the west-to-east temperature gradient in the tropical Pacific, the result would be a concentration of warming in a region where heat is less efficiently removed, raising the ECS of the Earth's climate system. Most climate models simulate that rising GHGs will weaken the east-west temperature gradient, which led the IPCC in the AR6 to conclude that data-driven ECS estimates understated the future ECS value.

However, Seager et al. (2019) pointed out that, contrary to models, the east-west temperature gradient has been strengthening rather than weakening over time. They further argued that the mechanism predicting otherwise in climate models was based on a faulty characterization of oceanic dynamics and there is no reason to expect the gradient to weaken. A similar argument was recently made by Lee et al. (2024), who concluded that “the trajectory of the observed trend reflects the response to increasing GHG loading in the atmosphere”; in other words, GHG warming should lead to a future strengthening rather than a weakening of the temperature gradient. Increased efficiency of atmospheric cooling implies, if anything, that the future ECS in a warming climate may be lower than current estimates.

5.4. Transient Climate Response

The Transient Climate Response (TCR) is of greater utility in providing an observational constraint on climate sensitivity. TCR is the amount of warming that would occur at the time when CO₂ doubles, having increased gradually by 1 percent each year over a period of 70 years. Relative to the ECS, observationally-determined values of TCR avoid the problems of uncertainties in ocean heat uptake and the fuzzy boundary in defining equilibrium arising from a range of timescales for the longer-term feedback processes (e.g., ice sheets). TCR is more generally related to peak warming and better constrained by historical warming, than ECS. The IPCC AR6 judged the very likely range of TCR to be 1.2–2.4°C. In contrast to ECS, the upper bound of the TCR is more tightly constrained. For comparison, the TCR values determined by Lewis (2023) is 1.25 to 2.0°C, showing much better agreement with the AR6 values than was seen in a comparison of the ECS values.

A related but more flexible parameter is the Transient Response to cumulative carbon Emissions, or TCRE, which relates global temperature change to the cumulative emissions. TCRE is based upon a linear relationship between global average temperature and cumulative emissions, which holds for cumulative emissions of up to 2 teratons of carbon. For a given value of TCRE, we can estimate the amount of warming expected over a future period in response to scenarios of cumulative carbon emission. The IPCC AR6 provides a very likely range for TCRE of 1.0–2.3°C, with a median value of 1.6°C.⁴⁸

As will be discussed in Chapter 6, a real-world ECS below the model average is supported by studies which show climate models on average estimate too much warming at the surface and in the troposphere compared to observations over the past 50 years. Also, lower values align with evidence from consistent fingerprinting (Section 8) that model responses to GHGs need to be scaled down quite a bit to align with observed trends.

5.5. Summary

In the past 5 years, there is a growing realization that climate models are not fit for the purpose of determining the sensitivity of the climate to increasing CO₂ (ECS), owing to the dependence of this sensitivity on poorly resolved processes related to clouds and water vapor.

Data-driven approaches using historical data and paleoclimate reconstructions are now regarded as more reliable for determining ECS, but their reliability is diminished by data inadequacies. The IPCC AR6 upper bound for the likely range of ECS is 4.0°C, lower than the AR5 value of 4.5°C. This lowering of the upper bound seems well justified by the paleoclimatic estimates of the ECS. The IPCC AR6 lower bound for the likely range of ECS is 2.5°C, substantially higher than the AR5 value of 1.5°C. This raising of the lower bound of the likely range of ECS has received a substantial challenge from the analysis of Lewis (2022, 2025) that finds the lower bound of the likely range to be 1.75°C with a median value of 2.2°C. Other lines of evidence supporting a lower bound on the ECS range below the IPCC AR6 value are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Mauritsen, T., & Roeckner, E. (2020). Tuning the MPI-ESM1.2 global climate model to improve the match with instrumental record warming by lowering its climate sensitivity. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 12, e2019MS002037;
<https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1029/2019MS002037>

Zelinka, M. D., Myers, T. A., McCoy, D. T., Po-Chedley, S., Caldwell, P. M., Ceppi, P., et al. (2020). Causes of higher climate sensitivity in CMIP6 models. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2019GL085782.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085782>

1. Lan, X., Tans, P. and K.W. Thoning: Trends in globally-averaged CO₂ determined from NOAA Global Monitoring Laboratory measurements. Version Monday, 14-Apr-2025 09:08:57 MDT
<https://doi.org/10.15138/9N0H-ZH07>.

2. Zeke Hausfather, "Explainer: How Scientists Estimate Climate Sensitivity," Carbon Brief, July 22, 2020, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/explainer-how-scientists-estimate-climate-sensitivity>.

3. Jule Charney et al., "Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A Scientific Assessment," 1979, <https://doi.org/10.17226/12181>.
4. Rajendra K. Pachauri and Leo Meyer, *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report* (Geneva, CH: Intergovernmental panel on climate change, 2015).
5. "In-Depth Q&A: The IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report on Climate Science," Carbon Brief, August 9, 2021, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/in-depth-qa-the-ipccs-sixth-assessment-report-on-climate-science>.
6. Nicola Scafetta, "Testing the CMIP6 GCM Simulations versus Surface Temperature Records from 1980–1990 to 2011–2021: High ECS Is Not Supported," *Climate* 9, no. 11 (2021): 161, <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9110161>.
7. Brian J. Soden and Isaac M. Held, "An Assessment of Climate Feedbacks in Coupled Ocean–Atmosphere Models," *Journal of Climate* 19, no. 14 (July 15, 2006): 3354–3360, <https://doi.org/10.1175/jcli3799.1>.
8. S. C. Sherwood et al., "An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence," *Reviews of Geophysics* 58, no. 4 (July 22, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019rg000678>.
9. Judith A. Curry and Peter J. Webster, "Thermodynamic Feedbacks in the Climate System," in *Thermodynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans* (New York, NY: Academic Press, 1999), 351–385.
10. Rajendra K. Pachauri and Leo Meyer, *Climate Change*.
11. D. Chen et al., "Framing, Context, and Methods."
12. Mark D. Zelinka et al., "Causes of Higher Climate Sensitivity in CMIP6 Models," *Geophysical Research Letters* 47, no. 1 (2020): e2019GL085782, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085782>.
13. Thorsten Mauritsen and Johann Jungclaus, "Tuning the MPI-ESM1.2 Global Climate Model to Improve the Match With Instrumental Record Warming by Lowering Its Climate Sensitivity," *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems* 12, no. 7 (2020): e2019MS002037, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS002037>.
14. Alexander Otto et al., "Energy Budget Constraints on Climate Response," *Nature Geoscience* 6, no. 6 (May 19, 2013): 415–416, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1836>.
15. Steven C. Sherwood and Chris E. Forest, "Opinion: Can Uncertainty in Climate Sensitivity Be Narrowed Further?" *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 24, no. 5 (2024): 2679–2686, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-2679-2024>.
16. "Why Low-End 'Climate Sensitivity' Can Now Be Ruled Out," Carbon Brief, July 22, 2020, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/guest-post-why-low-end-climate-sensitivity-can-now-be-ruled-out>.
17. S. C. Sherwood et al., "An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity."
18. D. Chen et al., "Framing, Context, and Methods."
19. Nicholas Lewis, "Objectively Combining Climate Sensitivity Evidence," *Climate Dynamics* 61, no. 9–10 (2023): 3155–3163, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06398-8>.

20. Ibid.
 21. Steven C. Sherwood and Chris E. Forest, "Opinion: Can Uncertainty in Climate Sensitivity Be Narrowed Further?"
 22. Nicholas Lewis, "Comment on 'Can Uncertainty in Climate Sensitivity Be Narrowed Further?' by Sherwood and Forest (2024)," EGU sphere [preprint], 2025, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-1179>.
 23. P. Forster et al., (2021): The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V. et al. (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, 2021.
 24. Richard Seager et al., "Strengthening Tropical Pacific Zonal Sea Surface Temperature Gradient Consistent with Rising Greenhouse Gases," *Nature Climate Change* 9, no. 7 (2019): 517–522, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0505-x>.
 25. Sangyeop Lee et al., "Zonal Contrasts of the Tropical Pacific Climate Predicted by a Global Constraint," *Climate Dynamics* 62, no. 1–2 (2024): 229–246, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-023-06741-7>.
 26. D. Chen et al., "Framing, Context, and Methods."
 27. Nicholas Lewis, "Objectively Combining Climate Sensitivity Evidence."
 28. Rajendra K. Pachauri and Leo Meyer, *Climate Change*.
 29. Nicholas Lewis, "Objectively Combining Climate Sensitivity Evidence."
 30. Nicholas Lewis, "Comment on 'Can Uncertainty in Climate Sensitivity Be Narrowed Further?' by Sherwood and Forest (2024)."
- Nierenberg, William et al. (1983) *Changing Climate: Report of the Carbon Dioxide Assessment Committee*. Washington, National Academies Press 1983.

6. Models versus Observations in the Recent Past

6.1. Introduction

Climate models are the primary tool used to project future climate changes in response to increasing atmospheric levels of anthropogenic greenhouse gases. They provide the theoretical evidence underpinning energy policy changes, such as efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. In order to determine the value of climate models for this purpose, it is reasonable to ask how well they have reproduced climate variations over the recent past, say the last half-century.

Of great concern is the fact that, after several decades of the climate modeling enterprise involving approximately three dozen models operated by research centers around the world, the range of future warming they produce in response to a hypothetical doubling of atmospheric CO₂ extends over a factor of three. This range of disagreement among models has not changed for decades.

Problems with climate models are not just in their disagreement over the future, but also in their ability to replicate the recent past. Here we review some of the most important metrics of climate model accuracy: ability to reproduce historical surface, tropospheric and stratospheric temperature trends, ability to reproduce the vertical warming profile and ability to reproduce other climate features such as snowfall and humidity. In all cases a persistent finding is that models on average err on the side of too much warming in response to observed historical forcings.

6.2. Surface warming

A straightforward test of climate model validity is its ability to reproduce historical warming in response to known past changes in climate drivers such as greenhouse gases. Figure 6.1 is reproduced from Scaffeta (2023), a peer-reviewed 2023 study which groups the latest-generation (CMIP6) climate models into low ECS (1.5 to 3.0 degrees C), medium ECS (3.0 to 4.5 degrees C) and high ECS (4.5 to 6.0 degrees C), and compares their post-1980 global average temperature simulation ranges to those of three surface temperature records and one satellite-based lower troposphere temperature data product.

Columns correspond to model groups showing low-ECS to high-ECS. Rows correspond to widely-used observed temperature records, the first three showing surface averages and the fourth showing the lower troposphere average. In each panel the yellow area denotes the mean and range ($\pm$ one standard deviation) of climate model simulations for that group. The thick black line shows the observed annual average temperature in the indicated source.

Examination of the leftmost column shows that the low-ECS models track the post-1980 historical warming record reasonably well, but the middle and right columns show that the medium- and high-ECS models conspicuously over-predict the warming.





Figure 6.1: model-observational comparisons for Earth's surface warming. Source: Scafetta N. Climate Dynamics 2023 Fig.2. Rows: temperature data products as indicated. Columns: Low- to High-ECS models. Observations: black line. Model simulations: yellow band.

Spencer (2024) has also provided a useful summary of the Model-Observation mismatch by focusing on average surface temperature data products versus the average climate model warming, summarized in Figure 6.2.

Global Average Surface-Air Temperature Variations, 1979–2022

DEPARTURE FROM 1951–2020 AVERAGE, IN DEGREES CELSIUS



NOTE: Figures have been adjusted to align trends starting in 1979.

SOURCES: Authors' calculations based on data from five different observation-based datasets and 35 climate models taking part in the sixth IPCC Climate Model Intercomparison Project, and KNMI Climate Explorer, "Starting Point," <https://climate.knmi.nl/Start.asp> (accessed January 10, 2024).

Figure 6.2: Models versus observations at the surface. Source: Spencer (2024)

6.3. Tropospheric warming

It has long been known that climate models on average overstate warming in the troposphere over the tropics. Since this region generates the bulk of atmospheric warming in a GCM it is important to get the trends right. The discrepancy was flagged as a serious inconsistency in the first US Climate Change Science Program report (Karl et al. 2006) and has been mentioned in every IPCC report since, but it has gotten worse over time not better, and the bias is now global. McKittrick and Christy (2020) compare tropospheric warming rates in CMIP6 climate models to observations from satellites, weather balloons and reanalysis systems (Figure 6.3). Every single model overpredicts the observed warming trend in both Lower- and Mid-Troposphere layers, both globally and in the tropics (Figure 6.4).

In most individual cases the bias is statistically significant and on average it is highly significant. McKittrick and Christy (2020) also show that the bias is larger in high-ECS models, but even the models with lower average ECS predict too much warming. If a group of models were to appear that had a realistic representation of global tropospheric warming, it would likely have to have a lower ECS than even the low-ECS members of the CMIP6 ensemble




Figure 6.3: Models versus observations in the global troposphere. Source: McKittrick and Christy (2020). Gray lines: model runs. Black: average model run. Blue: average of satellite, radiosonde and reanalysis observations.





Figure 6.4: Modeled versus observed warming trends in the global troposphere. Adapted from McKittrick and Christy (2020). Red dots: model warming trend in $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{decade}$ with 95% confidence interval bars. Gray dots: observed warming trends in 3 data products (satellite, radiosondes and reanalysis) and 95% confidence interval bars.

Spencer (2024) shows the mismatch is also present in the lower troposphere:

CHART 3

Global Lower Atmospheric Temperature Variations, 1979~2022

DEPARTURE FROM 1991-2020 AVERAGE, IN DEGREES CELSIUS



NOTE: Figures have been adjusted to align trends starting in 1979.

SOURCES:

- Author's calculations based on data from Ross McKittrick and John Christy, "Persistent Warming Bias in CMIP6 Tropospheric Layers," *Earth and Space Science*, Vol. 7, No. 11 (Nov 14, 2020), <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2020EF000128> (accessed January 10, 2023).
- Author's calculations based on data from American Meteorological Society, *State of the Climate in 2022*, <https://www.wamweather.gov/index.cfm/analysis/bulletin-of-the-american-meteorological-society-bulletin-of-the-climate/> (accessed January 9, 2023).

BG3809 heritage.org

Figure 6.5: Comparison of average trends in lower troposphere, 1979-2022. Source: Spencer (2024).

As mentioned the IPCC has long acknowledged the model-observational mismatch. The AR6 pp. 443-444 confirms model-observational mismatch in the troposphere the tropics (it does not address the global comparison):

Several studies since AR5 have continued to demonstrate an inconsistency between simulated and observed temperature trends in the tropical troposphere, with models simulating more warming than observations (Mitchell et al., 2013, 2020; Santer et al., 2017a, b; McKittrick and Christy, 2018; Po-Chedley et al., 2021)... Over the 1979–2014 period, models are more consistent with observations in the lower troposphere, and least consistent in the upper troposphere around 200 hPa, where biases exceed 0.1°C per decade. Several studies using CMIP6 models suggest that differences in climate sensitivity may be an important factor contributing to the discrepancy between the simulated and observed tropospheric temperature trends (McKittrick and Christy, 2020; Po-Chedley et al., 2021), though it is difficult to deconvolve the influence of climate sensitivity, changes in aerosol forcing and internal variability in contributing to tropospheric warming biases (Po-Chedley et al., 2021). Another study found that the absence of a hypothesized negative tropical cloud feedback could explain half of the upper troposphere warming bias in one model (Mauritsen and Stevens, 2015).

... In summary, studies continue to find that CMIP5 and CMIP6 model simulations warm more than observations in the tropical mid- and upper-troposphere over the 1979–2014 period (Mitchell et al., 2013, 2020; Santer et al., 2017a, b; Suárez-Gutiérrez et al., 2017; McKittrick and Christy, 2018), and that

Figure 6.6: Vertical warming pattern by latitude band. Source: IPCC AR5 Figure 10.SM.1

The Figure is not referenced in the main report nor in any summary. What it shows, although it is not apparent at first glance, is that the 1979-2010 warming in the lower troposphere is so minimal it is consistent with models having no GHG forcing in them at all, and is inconsistent with the model runs that do have GHG forcing. Here is the main global band (60S to 60N) expanded with the observed trends highlighted in yellow:




Figure 6.7: Adapted from IPCC AR5 Figure 10.SM.1

The next version of the Figure draws further detail out of the tropics band:




Figure 6.8: Adapted from IPCC AR5 Figure 10.SM.1.

In the tropics, where the models say the warming should be strongest, the observations (shown here in white) lie within the “No CO₂” band and entirely outside the “with CO₂” red envelope. This means that in the entire tropical atmospheric column from the surface to the stratosphere, *observed warming trends are so small they are consistent with the output of models that have no CO₂ warming effect in them, and they are inconsistent with the entire envelope of warming trends generated by models forced with increased CO₂.*

A similar comparison is shown in Christy and McNider (2017), an updated version of which (covering 1979-2024) is reproduced as Figure 6.9. Modeled temperature trends exceed balloon observations from the surface through the top of the troposphere, with observed trends below the entire model range at most pressure levels. Also shown in Figure 6.9 is the TTT layer average from three satellite data products (NOAA, UAH and RSS) compared to the same layer average from climate models for 1979-2024. Again the observed trends lie below the entire model range.




Figure 6.9: Modeled versus observed warming, tropical troposphere. Source: Christy and McNider (2017).

Some defenders of the models have argued that even if there is very little observed warming aloft in the tropics, a “hotspot” still exists in the sense that the warming aloft is greater than at the surface. But there is good evidence that models also exaggerate the amplification rate. Klotzbach et al. (2009), which was not discussed in the AR6, showed that models project greater amplification with altitude than is observed. That paper gave rise to an online debate over whether the amplification rates were being correctly calculated, and whether the discrepancy between models and observations was statistically significant. The topic involves very advanced statistical theory and was dealt with by two experts in time series analysis (Vogelsang and Nawaz 2016) who found that Klotzbach’s conclusions were valid, and that observed amplification is significantly smaller than the model-projected rates. The IPCC AR6 made no mention of this work either.

6.5. Stratospheric cooling

An important element of the expected general “fingerprint” of anthropogenic climate change is simultaneous warming of the troposphere and cooling of the stratosphere. The IPCC AR6 acknowledged that cooling had been observed but only up to 2000. Thereafter the stratosphere has exhibited some warming, contrary to model projections.

The AR6 WG1 Ch 2 pp. 327-9 states (emphasis added):

“Temperatures averaged through the full lower stratosphere (roughly 10–25 km) have decreased over 1980–2019 in all data products, with the bulk of the decrease prior to 2000. The decrease holds even if the influence of the El Chichon (1982) and Pinatubo (1991) volcanic eruptions on the trend, found by Steiner et al. (2020a) to have increased the 1979–2018 cooling trend by 0.06°C per decade, is removed. **Most datasets show no significant or only marginally significant trends over 2000–2019, and the results of Philipona et al. (2018) show weak increases over 2000–2015** in the very lowermost stratosphere sampled by radiosondes....

It is virtually certain that the lower stratosphere has cooled since the mid-20th century. However, most datasets show that **lower stratospheric temperatures have stabilized since the mid-1990s with no significant change over the last 20 years**. It is likely that middle and upper stratospheric temperatures have decreased since 1980, but there is low confidence in the magnitude.

The cited source, Philipona et al. (2018), in an article entitled “Radiosondes Show That After Decades of Cooling, the Lower Stratosphere Is Now Warming”, stated:

“In response to continued greenhouse gas increases and stratospheric ozone depletion, climate models project continued tropospheric warming and stratospheric cooling over the coming decades. Global average satellite observations of lower stratospheric temperatures exhibit no significant trends since the turn of the century. In contrast, an analysis of vertically resolved radiosonde measurements from 60 stations shows an increase of lower stratospheric temperature since the turn of the century at altitudes between 15 and 30 km and over most continents. Trend estimates are somewhat sensitive to homogeneity assessment choices, but all investigated radiosonde data sets suggest a change from late twentieth century cooling to early 21st century warming in the lower stratosphere.”

6.6. Water vapour trends

Much of the warming in climate models derives not from GHG increases themselves but from water vapour feedbacks: extra warming induced by the projected accumulation of water vapour in the atmosphere after it warms due to CO₂. But new evidence (Simpson et al. 2024) shows that models have over-projected increases in humidity.

“Water vapor in the atmosphere is expected to rise with warming because a warmer atmosphere can hold more moisture. However, over the last four decades, near-surface water vapor has not increased over arid and semi-arid regions. This is contrary to all climate model simulations in which it rises at a rate close to theoretical expectations, even over dry regions. This may indicate a major model misrepresentation of hydroclimate-related processes; models increase water vapor to satisfy the increased atmospheric demand, while this has not happened in reality.”

(Simpson et al. 2024)

While the models and observations matched over the 1988 to 2006 interval they diverge after that, directly contradicting model projections.

6.7. Snow cover

According to the Rutgers University Snow Lab (undated) the Northern Hemisphere winter snow cover shows an increasing trend over time.




Figure 6.10: Northern Hemisphere Winter Snow extent. Source: https://climate.rutgers.edu/snowcover/chart_seasonal.php?ui_set=nhl&ui_season=1 (February 24, 2024)

Models project declining Northern Hemisphere snow cover due to climate warming. But observations do not support this, as explained by Connolly et al. (2019).

Observed changes in Northern Hemisphere snow cover from satellite records were compared to those predicted by all available Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (“CMIP5”) climate models over the duration of the satellite’s records, i.e., 1967–2018. A total of 196 climate model runs were analyzed (taken from 24 climate models). Separate analyses were conducted for the annual averages and for each of the seasons (winter, spring, summer, and autumn/fall). A longer record (1922–2018) for the spring season which combines ground-based measurements with satellite measurements was also compared to the model outputs. **The climate models were found to poorly explain the observed trends. While the models suggest snow cover should have steadily decreased for all four seasons, only spring and summer exhibited a long-term decrease, and the pattern of the observed decreases for these seasons was quite different from the modelled predictions.** Moreover, the observed trends for autumn and winter suggest a long-term increase, although these trends were not statistically significant.

Connolly et al. (2019), emphasis added.

6.8. US Corn Belt

One of the largest discrepancies between models and observations can be found when we test them in a region of particular importance to global food production: the U.S. Corn Belt. Fig. 6.11 shows the warming trends for summertime (June, July, August) for the U.S. 12-state Corn Belt (IN, IA, NE, ND, SD, MO, MN, WI, MI, OH, KS, NE) during 1973-2022. All 36 climate models (red) produced too much warming compared to observations (blue) during 1973 to 2022.




Figure 6.11: Modeled versus observed warming trends in the US corn belt.

As discussed in Chapter 10, the anticipated negative effects of increasing temperatures on U.S. corn yields have not materialized, which is in contrast to widely publicized studies proclaiming that theoretical future impacts are already being experienced (e.g. Seager et al., 2017).

Summarizing:

- Climate models show warming biases in many aspects of their reproduction of the past few decades.
- They produce too much warming at the surface (except in the models with lowest ECS), too much warming in the lower-and mid-troposphere and too much amplification of warming aloft
- They also produce too much stratospheric cooling, too much water vapor increase, too much snow loss, and too much warming in the corn belt.
- The IPCC has acknowledged some of these issues, buried the amplification problem and ignored others.

- The warm bias discussed here is consistent with independent evidence of model bias presented in Chapters 5 (measuring climate sensitivity) and 7 (optimal fingerprinting). Given the persistent warm bias in so many key aspects of climate model performance, users are justified in assuming that projections of future warming are also very likely to be biased too warm.

7. Uncertainties in Climate Change Attribution

7.1. Introduction

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) distinguishes between detection of climate change and attribution of cause. As defined by the IPCC AR6 WGI Glossary (IPCC, 2025):

Detection: "Detection of change is defined as the process of demonstrating that climate or a system affected by climate has changed in some defined statistical sense, without providing a reason for that change. An identified change is detected in observations if its likelihood of occurrence by chance due to internal variability alone is determined to be small, for example, <10%."

Attribution: "Attribution is defined as the process of evaluating the relative contributions of multiple causal factors to a change or event with a formal assessment of confidence."

Both steps rely on statistical analysis. Detection focuses on whether changes are significant enough to stand out from random variation regardless of cause. Attribution involves comparison of observed events to model-generated counterfactuals. Since experimentation on the climate is not possible attribution requires statistical inference to assess how much human activities, such as GHG emissions, versus natural factors, like volcanic eruptions, explain observed changes. Attribution methods assume all external and internal drivers of the system are known and represented.

There are ongoing scientific debates around attribution methods, especially for attributing extreme weather events to climate change. The IPCC has long cautioned that methods to establish causality in climate science are inherently uncertain and ultimately depend on expert judgement. The Fourth Assessment Report: The Physical Science Basis (Hegerl et al., 2007) explained it as follows:

'Attribution' of causes of climate change is the process of establishing the most likely causes for the detected change with some defined level of confidence... unequivocal attribution would require controlled experimentation with the climate system. Since that is not possible, in practice attribution of anthropogenic climate change is understood to mean demonstration that a detected change is 'consistent with the estimated responses to the given combination of anthropogenic and natural forcing' and 'not consistent with alternative, physically plausible explanations of recent climate change that exclude important elements of the given combination of forcings' (IPCC, 2001)... The approaches used in detection and attribution research described above cannot fully account for all uncertainties, and thus ultimately expert judgement is required to give a calibrated assessment of whether a specific cause is responsible for a given climate change.

The Fifth Assessment Report Working Group II makes the following statement: (Cramer et al., 2014):

"Two broad challenges to the detection and attribution of climate change impacts relate to observations and process understanding. On the observational side, high-quality, long-term data relating to natural and human systems and the multiple factors affecting them are rare. In addition, the detection and

attribution of climate change impacts requires an understanding of the processes by which climate change, in conjunction with other factors, may affect the system in question.”

Because of the complexity of the causal chains in the climate system, investigation of these relationships is exceptionally challenging.

7.2 Attribution methods

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) employs several attribution methods to assess the causes of observed climate changes, distinguishing between natural and human-induced factors. Below is a concise description of the key methods that have been used by the IPCC:

Optimal Fingerprinting uses linear regression to explain variations in observed climate data as a weighted sum of climate model simulations run with and without anthropogenic forcings. The data used in the regression model are weighted to try to minimize the influence of random noise and the estimation method is chosen to take account of climate model error.

Time Series Analysis exploits statistical differences between anthropogenic forcing and natural variability to see which one dominates observed temperatures, and also uses variations in the timing of changes to determine if causal dependence across data series can be inferred.

Process-Based Attribution focuses on understanding the physical mechanisms behind observed changes. This approach combines observations, climate models, and theoretical understanding to attribute changes in specific processes to forcings. This approach is often used for regional climate phenomena, such as monsoon changes or polar amplification

Extreme Event Attribution assesses in the role of human influence in the likelihood of occurrence or intensity of extreme weather events (e.g. heat waves, droughts). Methods include:

Probabilistic Event Attribution uses large ensembles of climate model simulations to compare observed events to model-generated counterfactuals

Storyline Approach examines the physical processes driving an event and evaluates how anthropogenic forcings may have modified those processes

7.3 Attribution of global warming

Attribution statements for global warming in the three most recent IPCC Assessment reports are:

AR4: “Most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations.” (IPCC, 2007)

AR5: “It is *extremely likely* that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in greenhouse gas

concentrations and other anthropogenic forcings together. The best estimate of the human- induced contribution to warming is similar to the observed warming over this period.” (IPCC, 2013)

AR6: “The *likely* range of total human-caused global surface temperature increase from 1850–1900 to 2010–2019 is 0.8°C to 1.3°C, with a best estimate of 1.07°C. It is *likely* that well-mixed GHGs contributed a warming of 1.0°C to 2.0°C, other human drivers (principally aerosols) contributed a cooling of 0.0°C to 0.8°C, natural drivers changed global surface temperature by –0.1°C to +0.1°C, and internal variability changed it by –0.2°C to +0.2°C. It is *very likely* that well-mixed GHGs were the main driver of tropospheric warming since 1979.” (IPCC, 2021)

The AR4 and AR5 attribution statements reference the warming since the mid-20th century, the period when greenhouse gas emissions began rapidly increasing. The words “most” and “more than half” are deliberately imprecise, potentially ranging from 51 to 99% of the warming – presumably this imprecision is to account for structural uncertainties such as natural internal variability. The confidence level increases from *very likely* to *extremely likely* from AR4 to AR5. The structure of the attribution statement in the AR6 is fundamentally different, referencing the warming to the period 1850-1900. The AR6 attribution statement is more precise numerically, but with a lower level of confidence at “likely” – the AR6 attributes essentially all of the warming to increases in greenhouse gases. The most confident statement from the AR6 relates to the tropospheric warming since 1979, using the words “main driver” and “*very likely*.”

There are three areas of substantive criticism of the IPCC assessment of the causes of the recent warming: inadequate assessment of natural climate variability, inappropriate statistical methods, and substantial discrepancies between models and observations. The latter is discussed in Chapter 7. The other two factors are discussed herein. Both of these issues are relevant not only in context of the main policy-relevant statement of the IPCC concerning attribution of the recent warming, but also because the global warming attribution provides the basis for extreme event attribution

7.2. Natural climate variability

The IPCC AR6 states that natural external drivers since 1850-1900 have changed global surface temperature by –0.1°C to +0.1°C, and internal variability has changed it by –0.2°C to +0.2°C – on average, having essentially no net impact on the warming since 1850-1900. This assessment of the contributions of natural variability has been disputed by a number of publications that question the magnitudes of the contributions from solar forcing and internal variability from the large-scale ocean circulations (R Connolly et al., 2021; W Soon, 2023).

If the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity to CO₂ is low (Chapter 5), then natural climate variability becomes more important in the attribution of the recent warming. Further, if natural variability is higher, then estimates of the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity from the historical period would be lower (Scafetta, 2023).

Solar variability

The IPCC AR5 concluded that the best estimate of radiative forcing due to Total Solar Irradiance (TSI) changes for the period 1750–2011 was 0.05 W/m^2 (Myrhe et al., 2014). The IPCC AR6 acknowledges a much larger range of estimates of changes in TSI over the last several centuries, stating that the TSI between the Maunder Minimum (1645–1715) and the second half of the twentieth century increased by $0.7\text{--}2.7 \text{ W/m}^2$, a range that includes both low and high variability TSI data sets (Gulev, 2021). However, the recommended forcing dataset for the CMIP6 climate model simulations used in the AR6 for attribution studies averages two data sets with low solar variability (Matthes, 2017).

While the IPCC AR6 shows a substantially greater solar impact than does the AR5, the overall impact on the climate was assessed to be small compared to anthropogenic forcing of climate change. However, the impact of solar variations on the climate is uncertain and subject to substantial debate – something that you would not infer from the IPCC assessment reports (Lockwood, 2012; Connolly et al., 2021).

Exactly how TSI has changed over time has been a challenging problem to resolve. Since 1978, there have been direct measurements of TSI from satellites. However, the data exhibit non-negligible inconsistencies, and interpreting any multi-decadal trends in TSI requires comparisons of observations from overlapping satellites. There are several rival composite TSI datasets, disagreeing as to whether TSI increased or decreased during the period 1986–96 (the ACRIM gap; see Chapter 4). Further, the satellite record of TSI is used for calibrating proxy models, whereby past solar variations are inferred from sunspots and cosmogenic isotope measurements (Velasco Herrera et al., 2015).

There is substantial evidence for high solar activity in the second half of the 20th century (starting in 1959) and extending into the 1990's, before a decline in the early 21st century; this period is often termed the “Modern Maximum.” (Chatzistergos et al., 2023; Solanki et al., 2004; Usoskin et al., 2007). However, some scientists have concluded that it is not possible to be confident of any multi-decadal trend in TSI (Schmutz, 2021).

As a result of this uncertainty, some reconstructions for past values of TSI (since 1750) have low variability, implying a very low impact of solar variations on global mean surface temperature, whereas datasets with high TSI variability can explain more than 70% percent of the temperature variability since preindustrial times (Scafetta, 2013; Stefani, 2021). Hence, the choice of which TSI satellite record used in an analysis can substantially influence how much climate change is attributed to human versus natural forcings.

There is growing evidence that other aspects of solar variability, which are referred to as solar indirect effects, amplify TSI forcing or are independent of TSI forcing. Scafetta et al. (2023) suggests that ~80% of solar influence on climate may stem from non-TSI mechanisms. Candidate processes include: solar ultraviolet changes; energetic particle precipitation; atmospheric-electric-field effect on cloud cover; cloud changes produced by solar-modulated galactic cosmic rays; large relative changes in the magnetic field; and the strength of the solar wind. Solar indirect effects are not included in climate models, although indirect methods of estimating these effects suggest significant influence. However, claims of non-TSI mechanisms influencing climate are uncertain and debated.

Natural variability of large-scale ocean circulations

Variations in global mean surface temperature are linked to recurrent large-scale variations in ocean circulation patterns. These circulation patterns include the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO). These circulation patterns influence ocean heat uptake and heat distribution, and also influence atmospheric circulation patterns and cloud distributions. There is some debate as to whether these variations are strictly internal to the climate system, or whether this variability can have a solar/astronomical origin or can be influenced by large volcanic eruptions.

While climate models simulate the large-scale ocean circulations and internal climate variability, the simulated magnitude in the multi-decadal band is too low in most models relative to observations, and the phasing of the variability in long-term climate simulations is not synced with the actual, observed climate variations (Kravtsov et al. 2024). Averaging multiple simulations from climate models effectively averages out the internal variations, leaving only the forced climate variability (e.g., CO₂ forcing). With most of the modern warming beginning in the late 1970's, the recent 50-year warming is on the same time scale as the multi-decadal oscillations of the AMO and PDO.

Here are summary statements from the IPCC AR5 and AR6 reports:

"Decadal variability in the Pacific, associated with the PDO or IPO, contributes significantly to regional and global temperature trends, but the relative contributions of internal variability and external forcing are difficult to disentangle in CMIP5 simulations." (IPCC, 2013)

"Since AR5, there has been increased understanding of the role of internal variability, such as ENSO, PDO, and AMO, in modulating regional climate trends. However, limitations in simulating the exact timing and amplitude of these modes in CMIP6 models contribute to uncertainties in attributing observed changes to anthropogenic forcing (high confidence)." (IPCC, 2021)

The amplitude of the peak-to-trough impact of the multi-decadal oscillations on global temperatures has been assessed by the IPCC AR6: "The likely range of change due to internal variability is -0.2°C to +0.2°C (IPCC, 2021)." This implies a trough-to-peak change of 0.4°C. Over many centuries, any global temperature changes from the troughs and peaks will cancel out, with little to no net impact.

However, with a nominal timescale of 60-80 years for oscillations such as the AMO and PDO, the timing of the peaks and troughs can be confused with the secular trend. This becomes very relevant for attributing the warming for the 50 years since 1975, during which most of the warming has occurred. Even if climate models have the correct amplitude of the multidecadal oscillations, the timing of the peaks and troughs is not adequately simulated, with each model and individual ensemble simulating a different phasing. Once the simulations of the ensemble members and different models are averaged, the natural internal variability contribution is averaged out, effectively cancelling the role of natural internal variability in the attribution process.

The Great Pacific Climate Shift of 1976-1977 was a notable climatic event characterized by an abrupt change in the North Pacific Ocean's atmosphere-ocean system that interacted with global climate

patterns. This shift is closely associated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) that oscillates between warm and cool phases over decades. The 1976 shift marked a transition from a predominantly negative (cool) PDO phase (1947–1976) to a positive (warm) phase (1977 through 2000), with significant implications for global and regional climate patterns including the frequencies of El Niño and La Niña events. The Great Pacific Climate Shift coincided with the beginning of a period of accelerated global warming (REF TO A FIG OF GLOBAL TEMP ANOMALIES ELSEWHERE IN DOC) When the Great Pacific Climate Shift is accounted for in climate attribution analyses since 1950, it has been found that 40 percent or more of the warming in the second half of the 20th century was caused by natural internal variability (McLean et al., 2009; Tung and Zhou, 2013; Chylek et al., 2016; Scafetta, 2021).

7.3. Optimal fingerprinting

Optimal fingerprinting is a statistical technique introduced by Allen and Tett (1999) that compares observed climate data to climate model simulations to identify patterns (or "fingerprints") associated with human or natural forcing. It involves taking a vector of observed climate changes, such as warming rates in locations around the world, and decomposing them into a weighted sum of "signals", which are analogues to the observations generated by climate models with different types of forcings. The weights are chosen using a regression method called Total Least Squares. The analysis commonly uses just two signals, one generated by models using only anthropogenic forcings and one using only natural forcings. If the estimated weighting coefficient attached to a signal is significantly different from zero, then that signal is said to be "detected". If it is close to 1.0, then the model generating the signal is said to be consistent with observations. If it is less than 1.0, then the model signal for that forcing is too strong and needs to be scaled down, and vice-versa. Both the observed data and the signals are weighted using a model-generated estimate of patterns of randomness in the climate system so as, in principle, to put maximum weight on regions where natural variability is minimized.

Optimal fingerprinting is the primary tool for attribution in the climate literature. Studies applying it have been cited thousands of times, and it has been prominently featured by the IPCC since the 2001 Third Assessment Report. One of its inherent weaknesses is that results depend on assumptions about the accuracy of climate models, especially regarding their representation of natural variability (IPCC AR5 Ch 10.2.3).

Additionally, a series of papers by McKittrick (McKittrick 2022a, 2022b, 2023, 2025) has challenged the optimal fingerprinting method, arguing that it is inherently unreliable and that commonly used practices in econometrics can provide more valid results. Statistical theory requires that for regression models to yield unbiased coefficients, a set of assumptions called the Gauss-Markov conditions must hold. McKittrick (2022a) argued that the Allen and Tett (1999) methodology violates the Gauss-Markov conditions, leading to potentially biased and inconsistent fingerprinting coefficients, undermining the reliability of the method. Chen et al. (2023) confirmed this analysis and argued that the method could yield unbiased results but only under very stringent assumptions. McKittrick (2022b) and (2023) raised a further concern that climate scientists—virtually alone among scientific disciplines—have used an estimation method called Total Least Squares (TLS) to estimate anthropogenic greenhouse gas signal coefficients, despite its tendency to be unreliable unless some strong assumptions hold that in practice are unlikely to be true. Under conditions which easily arise in optimal fingerprinting, TLS yields estimates with large

positive biases. Thus, any study that has used TLS for optimal fingerprinting without verifying that it is appropriate in the specific data context has likely overstated the result.

McKittrick (2025) presented an empirical example comparing the results of conventional optimal fingerprinting against methods drawn from mainstream econometrics which are known to be valid for the specific application of signal detection. While the IPCC optimal fingerprinting method yields an anthropogenic signal coefficient close to 1.0 on a global temperature data set spanning 1900 to 2010, consistent estimation yields a coefficient around 0.4, which rises to about 0.65 on data spanning 1980 to 2010, implying the model response to greenhouse gases needs to be scaled down by about half to optimally match observations. The natural forcing signal coefficient, by contrast, is between 2.0 and 4.0, implying the climate model signals of natural forcing need to be scaled up two-to four-fold to match observed climate change. The fingerprinting coefficients estimated in McKittrick (2025), when used to scale the average sensitivity of the climate models used to generate the forcing signals in his data set, imply a Transient Climate Sensitivity of 1.4°C, which matches the estimate by Lewis (2022) using a different estimation method and multiple independent data sets.

While these analyses do not prove that all of the results from using the IPCC optimal fingerprinting method are wrong, it does show that the basis on which they were believed to be correct is non-existent – hence reducing confidence in the results.

7.4. Time series methods

The IPCC (AR5 WGI 10.2.2) drew attention to alternative approaches of assessing causality that emerged from the time series econometrics literature. They have the advantage of not depending on assumptions about the accuracy of climate models, but their disadvantage is they depend on assumptions about the data generating process underlying climate and forcing data that are not straightforward to test. The methods, now referred to as climate econometrics, use the tools of unit root testing, Granger causality and cointegration analysis, all of which are familiar in economics and finance and which are slowly being adopted in climate science. Time series analysis methods hold out the possibility of determining whether anthropogenic or natural forcings are the primary drivers of climate change without requiring the use of climate models, although key questions remain unsettled (e.g. Dergiades et al. 2016, Balcombe et al. 2019, Dagsvik et al. 2020, Razzak 2022, Dagsvik and Moen 2023).

Granger causality modeling is a tool for determining directions of influence in data series that move together. “Granger causality” is a statistical, not a physical, concept. If knowing the current value of one variable significantly improves the forecast accuracy of another variable we can infer a causal connection exists; this is called Granger causality. The modeling tools, called vector autoregression, measure direct impulse-response patterns and feedbacks. An application to the well-known Vostok ice core data revealed an error by Al Gore in his documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*. Gore showed the data and drew attention to the coherence of temperature and CO₂ changes over a 440,000 year span, which he asserted was due to CO₂ driving temperature changes. But temperature changes can also affect atmospheric CO₂ levels. Davidson et al. (2015) examined the series and found that temperature Granger causes CO₂ but not the reverse. In other words on the time scales represented in the Vostok data the coherence in the

series is primarily due to the influence of temperature on CO₂ levels not the feedback going from CO₂ to temperature.

In summary, the main statistical methods for attributing causation in climate data are optimal fingerprinting and time series analysis. Applications of the Allen and Tett (1999) optimal fingerprinting method dominate the attribution literature and have underpinned past IPCC conclusions, but results depend on the accuracy of climate models and the method has recently been criticized as inherently biased. Time series methods do not depend on climate models but require assumptions of their own and have generated results that have thus far not converged on a consensus.

7.5. Extreme event attribution (EEA)

The IPCC AR6 provides an ambiguous assessment of the role of global warming in the historical record of extreme weather and climate events. Chapter 11 of WG1 states (Seneviratne et al., 2021):

“Evidence of observed changes in extremes and their attribution to human influence (including greenhouse gas and aerosol emissions and land-use changes) has strengthened since AR5, in particular for extreme precipitation, droughts, tropical cyclones and compound extremes (including dry/hot events and fire weather). Some recent hot extreme events would have been extremely unlikely to occur without human influence on the climate system.”

By contrast, Chapter 12 of WG1 (Table 12.12) paints a different picture – presumably, the expert judgment of different groups of authors for the two chapters came to different conclusions (Ranasinghe, 2021):

High confidence in an increase in extreme heat events in tropical regions where observations allow trend estimation and in most regions in the mid-latitudes, medium confidence elsewhere

Medium confidence in a decrease in extreme cold events in Australia, Africa and most of northern South America where observations allow trend estimation

No evidence of emergence in the historical period of a change in river floods, heavy precipitation, drought, fire weather, severe wind storms, and tropical cyclones

While the overall issue of detecting changes in extreme weather events and their attribution remains ambiguous, most of the activity in this area relates to the attribution of single extreme weather events. The most prominent effort is the World Weather Attribution (WWA; worldweatherattribution.org), which is an international research initiative that focuses on extreme event attribution analyzing how climate change influences the likelihood and intensity of extreme weather events. The approach used by the WWA runs large ensembles of regional climate models to compare the event in today’s climate, versus a pre-industrial counterfactual climate without human-caused warming.

WWA plays a prominent role in linking extreme weather to climate change and its press releases attract considerable public and policy discussions. However, the WWA’s tendency to promote non-peer-

reviewed findings, funding ties, open admission that they shape their analyses to serve purposes of litigation and other methodological challenges have sparked controversies, with critics questioning the robustness and impartiality of its conclusions (Pielke Jr. 2024). Despite these issues, WWA's work continues to shape climate science and media narratives. Technical criticisms of the approach include: neglect of a formal detection process; an implicit assumption that 100% of the post-industrial warming is caused by CO₂; and failure to adequately account for natural internal climate variability.

Because EEA is relatively new many basic methodological issues have yet to be settled in the expert literature. An important challenge is the lack of data. Extreme events are by definition rare. Many analyses of extreme event types (including the US National Assessment Reports) only evaluate data since 1950 or 1970. However, as emphasized by Chapter 8, many of the worst extreme weather and climate events in U.S. history occurred prior to the first half of the 20th century including in the early 19th century. And if paleoclimate reconstructions are considered, it becomes very difficult for an event to pass the detection thresholds of exceeding what is expected from natural variability, particularly if a reasonably sized geographic region is considered.

Another challenge is defining the event under study. There is a longstanding literature in statistics and econometrics on the challenge of analyzing data with outliers. The issue arises because a data series establishes a probability distribution defining the expected range of observations. If an outlier is observed it might indicate that the underlying process giving rise to the data distribution has changed (which in the weather context would mean a climatic change has been detected) or that the underlying process has multiple regimes each with a different probability distribution, in which case observing an outlier simply means we were temporarily in a different regime, but the system itself was unchanged. If a time series contains only a single outlier event at the end of the series it is not possible to determine which model is the correct one (Chen and Liu 1993). For instance, there might be an "ordinary" weather regime that yields a distribution of summer daytime highs in a particular coastal region, and a second "heatwave" regime that kicks in when an inland blocking event occurs, which yields a temperature distribution centered 15°C higher than the first one. A day with temperatures 13°C above normal would either be an extreme heat anomaly under the first regime or a somewhat cool event under the second, and we have no way in this case of knowing on statistical grounds which view is correct.

Visser and Petersen (2012) and Sardeshmukh et al. (2015) both point out that different distributions may fit observed data equally well but yield very different implications about the likelihood of a specific weather event. Visser and Petersen argue that, in view of the deep uncertainties of extreme weather analysis drawing a connection between individual events and global climate change should be avoided. Furthermore the existence of an outlier at the end of a data series poses the problem that estimates of the event probabilities will be biased whether the outlier is included or excluded (Barlow et al. 2020). Methods to eliminate the bias have not yet been established, leading some experts (e.g. Miralles and Davison 2023) to argue that in settings in which a data series contains a single extreme event at the end, estimation of a return period for the extreme event will be so biased and uncertain it should be avoided altogether.

In spite of these concerns, the U.S. is presently considering something like the WWA, which is being investigated by a NASEM Panel on Attribution of Extreme Weather and Climate Events and their impacts (NASEM, 2025).

A case studies from a recent high impact extreme events in the U.S. is provided to illustrate the challenges and ambiguities in attributing the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events to human-caused warming.

7.6. Case study – 2021 Western North America heat wave

The 2021 Western North America heat wave was an extreme heat wave that affected much of Western North America in late June 2021. In particular, surface temperature records were set in Portland, OR (116°F; previous record 107°F) and Seattle, WA (108 °F; previous record 103°F) (Mass et al., 2024).

The WWA team garnered international headlines for their analysis and provided the following attribution statements (WWA, 2021; Philip et al., 2022):

Based on observations and modeling, the occurrence of this heatwave was virtually impossible without human-caused climate change.

The event is estimated to be about a 1 in 1000-year event in today's climate.

The event would have been at least 150 times rarer without human-induced climate change.

This heatwave was about 2°C hotter than it would have been if it had occurred at the beginning of the industrial revolution (when global mean temperatures were 1.2°C cooler than today).

But an important caveat to the first claim is that other researchers concluded, based on historical weather data, that while a heat wave of the magnitude observed was indeed virtually impossible without anthropogenic climate change, it was also virtually impossible *with* climate change. Bercos-Hickey (2022) noted “these temperatures were virtually impossible under any previously experienced meteorological conditions, with or without global warming.” McKinnon and Simpson (2022) stated “the most likely explanation remains that the weather event itself was ‘bad luck.’” The 2023 Oregon Climate Assessment (Fleischman 2023) concluded that the heat dome would have formed even without climate change and “There is no evidence that the highly unusual combination of weather features that drove the heat dome were made more likely by climate change, and climate models do not project an increase in the frequency of high-pressure ridges over the Pacific Northwest” (Fleischman 2023 p. 49).

Mass et al. (2024) summarizes the proximate sequence of compound events leading to the heat wave. There was a record-breaking midtropospheric ridge over the Pacific Northwest, forced by a tropical disturbance in the western Pacific. This produced record-breaking midtropospheric temperatures, strong subsidence in the lower atmosphere, low-level easterly flow that produced downslope warming on regional terrain and the removal of cooler marine air, and an approaching low-level trough that enhanced downslope flow. The event occurred at a time of maximum solar insolation, and drier-than-normal soil moisture. Using a storyline approach, Mass et al. assessed that there is no trend in drought and dry soils in the Pacific Northwest; there is no evidence of global warming producing stronger ridges of high pressure, and no observed trend in heat waves or record temperatures in the region. They

concluded that although anthropogenic warming may have contributed as much as 2°F to the magnitude of the event, there is little evidence of further amplification of the event from increasing greenhouse gases.

A statistical analysis of a model-based attribution study of this heat wave was conducted by Bercos-Hickey et al. (2022). Because this event is a far outlier and far above the bounds of Generalized Extreme Value distributions fitted from historical data, they concluded that estimates of return times, quantitative changes in event magnitude and frequency, and probability of the extreme temperatures such as provided by the WWA are not accurate and should be interpreted as having low confidence. They found that hindcast attribution methods using an ensemble of regional climate models, combined with Pearl (2009) causal inferences, can provide limited and conditional information about the magnitude of the human influence on this heatwave – they provided a more highly constrained estimate that human activities caused a ~1.4°C–1.8°F increase in the daily maximum temperatures.

Zeder et al. (2023) also concluded that the methods employed by Philip et al. (2022) tend to overstate the rarity of extreme heat waves, leading to a biased perception of the effect of climate change on the heatwave event: “The tendency to overestimate the return period of observed extreme heatwave events may fuel the impression that seemingly impossible heatwave extremes are currently clustering at an unprecedented rate.”

The 2021 Western North America heatwave was a rare and unprecedented compound weather event, that broke century-old temperature records by as much as 9°F. While the WWA team received worldwide publicity for their rapid attribution claims blaming anthropogenic climate change, subsequent peer-reviewed analysis showed that the rare event was not made more probable by global warming.

7.7. Summary

There is an ongoing scientific debate around attribution methods, particularly in attributing extreme weather events to climate change. The IPCC has long cautioned that methods to establish causality in climate science are inherently uncertain and ultimately depend on expert judgement.

There are two areas of substantive criticism of the IPCC assessment of the causes of the recent warming: inadequate assessment of natural climate variability, and inappropriate statistical methods.

Detection of extreme weather events is challenged by their rarity, requiring a long data set and a choice of region and spatial scale to evaluate their occurrence against the background of natural weather and climate variability.

The most robust attribution statements for an extreme event relate to an incremental change (e.g. a temperature change in degrees or percent change in rainfall). Statements related to return times, quantitative changes in event magnitude and frequency, and probability of the extremes are not accurate owing to an inadequate amount of data, and are made with low confidence. There is no evidence in a change of weather or climate regime patterns from increasing greenhouse gases that would amplify or dampen extreme weather events, beyond basic thermodynamic considerations.

1. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. *IPCC Glossary*. Accessed May 2, 2025. <https://apps.ipcc.ch/glossary/>.
2. G. C. Hegerl et al., “Understanding and Attributing Climate Change,” in *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. S. Solomon et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 663–745.
3. J. T. Houghton et al., eds., *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1–881.
4. W. Cramer et al., “Detection and Attribution of Observed Impacts,” in *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. C. B. Field et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 979–1037.
5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. S. Solomon et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 10.
6. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. T. F. Stocker et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 17.
7. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 10.
8. Ronan Connolly et al., “How Much Has the Sun Influenced Northern Hemisphere Temperature Trends? An Ongoing Debate,” *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 21, no. 6 (2021): 131, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/21/6/131>.
9. Willie Soon et al., “The Detection and Attribution of Northern Hemisphere Land Surface Warming (1850–2018) in Terms of Human and Natural Factors: Challenges of Inadequate Data,” *Climate* 11, no. 9 (2023): 179, <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli11090179>.
10. Nicola Scafetta, “Empirical Assessment of the Role of the Sun in Climate Change Using Balanced Multi-Proxy Solar Records,” *Geoscience Frontiers* 14, no. 6 (November 2023): 101650, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsf.2023.101650>.
11. Gunnar Myhre et al., “Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing,” in *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. Thomas F. Stocker et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 659–740, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.018>.

12. Sergey K. Gulev et al., “Changing State of the Climate System,” in *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. V. Masson-Delmotte et al. (Geneva: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021), 287–422.
11. Katja Matthes et al., “Solar Forcing for CMIP6 (v3.2),” *Geoscientific Model Development* 10, no. 6 (June 22, 2017): 2247–2302, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-2247-2017>.
12. Mike Lockwood, “Solar Influence on Global and Regional Climates,” *Surveys in Geophysics* 33, no. 3–4 (May 16, 2012): 503–534, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-012-9181-3>.
13. Ronan Connolly et al., “How Much Has the Sun Influenced Northern Hemisphere Temperature Trends? An Ongoing Debate.”
14. Nicola Scafetta et al., “Modeling Quiet Solar Luminosity Variability from TSI Satellite Measurements and Proxy Models during 1980–2018,” *Remote Sensing* 11, no. 21 (November 1, 2019): 2569, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11212569>.
14. V. M. Velasco Herrera, B. Mendoza, and G. Velasco Herrera, “Reconstruction and Prediction of the Total Solar Irradiance: From the Medieval Warm Period to the 21st Century,” *New Astronomy* 34 (January 2015): 221–233, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2014.07.009>.
15. Theodosios Chatzistergos, Natalie A. Krivova, and Kok Leng Yeo, “Long-Term Changes in Solar Activity and Irradiance,” *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics* 252 (November 2023): 106150, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jastp.2023.106150>.
16. S. K. Solanki et al., “Unusual Activity of the Sun during Recent Decades Compared to the Previous 11,000 Years,” *Nature* 431, no. 7012 (October 28, 2004): 1084–1087, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02995>.
17. I. G. Usoskin, S. K. Solanki, and G. A. Kovaltsov, “Grand Minima and Maxima of Solar Activity: New Observational Constraints,” *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 471, no. 1 (June 6, 2007): 301–309, <https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20077704>.
18. Werner K. Schmutz, “Changes in the Total Solar Irradiance and Climatic Effects,” *Journal of Space Weather and Space Climate* 11 (2021): 40, <https://doi.org/10.1051/swsc/2021016>.
19. Nicola Scafetta, “Discussion on Climate Oscillations: CMIP5 General Circulation Models versus a Semi-Empirical Harmonic Model Based on Astronomical Cycles,” *Earth-Science Reviews* 126 (November 2013): 321–357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2013.08.008>.
20. Frank Stefani, “Solar and Anthropogenic Influences on Climate: Regression Analysis and Tentative Predictions,” *Climate* 9, no. 11 (November 3, 2021): 163, <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli9110163>.
21. Ronan Connolly et al., “Challenges in the Detection and Attribution of Northern Hemisphere Surface Temperature Trends Since 1850,” *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics* 23, no. 10 (2023): 105015, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/acf18e>.
22. Nicola Scafetta, “Empirical Assessment of the Role of the Sun in Climate Change Using Balanced Multi-Proxy Solar Records.”

24. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*.
25. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*.
26. Ibid.
27. J. D. McLean, C. R. de Freitas, and R. M. Carter, "Influence of the Southern Oscillation on Tropospheric Temperature," *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 114, no. D14 (July 23, 2009): D14104, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011637>.
28. Ka-Kit Tung and Jiansong Zhou, "Using Data to Attribute Episodes of Warming and Cooling in Instrumental Records," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, no. 6 (January 23, 2013): 2058–2063, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212471110>.
29. Petr Chylek et al., "The Role of Atlantic Multi-Decadal Oscillation in the Global Mean Temperature Variability," *Climate Dynamics* 47, no. 9–10 (February 20, 2016): 3271–3279, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3025-7>.
30. Nicola Scafetta, "Reconstruction of the Interannual to Millennial Scale Patterns of the Global Surface Temperature," *Atmosphere* 12, no. 2 (2021): 147, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12020147>.
31. Ross McKittrick, "Checking for Model Consistency in Optimal Fingerprinting: A Comment," *Climate Dynamics* 58, no. 1–2 (2022): 405–411, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05913-7>.
32. M. R. Allen and S. F. B. Tett, "Checking for Model Consistency in Optimal Fingerprinting," *Climate Dynamics* 15, no. 6 (1999): 419–434, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003820050291>.
33. Ross McKittrick, Timothy Vogelsang, and John Christy, "Temperature Trends, Climate Attribution and the Nonstationarity Question," *Earth System Dynamics Discussions* (2023): <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2023-11>.
34. Ross McKittrick, "Total Least Squares Bias in Climate Fingerprinting Regressions with Heterogeneous Noise Variances and Correlated Explanatory Variables," *Environmetrics* 35, no. 2 (March 2024): e2835, <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2835>.
35. S. Seneviratne et al., "Chapter 11: Weather and Climate Extreme Events in a Changing Climate." In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, et al., 1513–1766. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.013>.
36. R. Ranasinghe et al., "Chapter 12: Climate Change Information for Regional Impact and for Risk Assessment." In *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S.L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, et al., 1767–1926. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.014>.
37. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Attribution of Extreme Weather and Climate Events and Their Impacts*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, forthcoming.

<https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/attribution-of-extreme-weather-and-climate-events-and-their-impacts>.

38. C. Mass et al., “The Pacific Northwest Heat Wave of 25–30 June 2021: Synoptic/Mesoscale Conditions and Climate Perspective,” *Weather and Forecasting* 39, no. 2 (February 2024): 275–291, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-23-0154.1>.
39. World Weather Attribution. “Western North American Extreme Heat Virtually Impossible without Human-Caused Climate Change.” July 7, 2021. <https://www.worldweatherattribution.org/western-north-american-extreme-heat-virtually-impossible-without-human-caused-climate-change/>.
40. S.Y. Philip et al., “Rapid Attribution Analysis of the Extraordinary Heatwave on the Pacific Coast of the US and Canada June 2021,” *Earth System Dynamics* 13, no. 4 (December 8, 2022): 1689–1713, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-13-1689-2022>.
41. C. Mass et al., “The Pacific Northwest Heat Wave of 25–30 June 2021.”
42. Emily Bercos-Hickey et al., “Anthropogenic Contributions to the 2021 Pacific Northwest Heatwave,” *Geophysical Research Letters* 49, no. 23 (December 2022): e2022GL099396, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099396>.
43. Judea Pearl, *Causality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
44. Geert Jan van Oldenborgh et al., “Attributing and Projecting Heatwaves Is Hard: We Can Do Better,” *Earth’s Future* 10, no. 6 (June 2022): e2021EF002271, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002271>.
45. Christopher W. Landsea, “Hurricane Harvey’s Rainfall and Global Warming,” NOAA Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory, Hurricane Research Division, 2017, <https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/hrd/Landsea/harvey-global-warming.pdf>.
46. David M. Roth, “Tropical Cyclone Rainfall for the North Atlantic Basin,” Weather Prediction Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2017, <https://www.wpc.ncep.noaa.gov/tropical/rain/tcmaxima.html>.
47. Geert Jan van Oldenborgh et al., “Attribution of Extreme Rainfall from Hurricane Harvey, August 2017,” *Environmental Research Letters* 12, no. 12 (December 2017): 124009, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa9ef2>.
48. Kerry Emanuel, “Assessing the Present and Future Probability of Hurricane Harvey’s Rainfall,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, no. 48 (November 28, 2017): 12681–12684, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1716222114>.
49. Mark D. Risser and Michael F. Wehner, “Attributable Human-Induced Changes in the Likelihood and Magnitude of the Observed Extreme Precipitation During Hurricane Harvey,” *Geophysical Research Letters* 44, no. 24 (December 2017): 12,457–12,464, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075888>.
50. Kevin E. Trenberth et al., “Hurricane Harvey Links to Ocean Heat Content and Climate Change Adaptation,” *Earth’s Future* 6, no. 5 (May 2018): 730–744, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF000825>.
51. Christopher W. Landsea, “Hurricane Harvey’s Rainfall and Global Warming.”

52. Yog Aryal et al., “Long Term Changes in Flooding and Heavy Rainfall Associated with North Atlantic Tropical Cyclones: Roles of the North Atlantic Oscillation and El Niño–Southern Oscillation,” *Journal of Hydrology* 559 (2018): 698–710, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.02.072>.

Kravtsov, S., A. Westgate and A. Gavrilov (2024) Global-scale multidecadal variability in climate models and observations, part II: The stadium wave. *Climate Dynamics* Volume 62, pages 10281–10306 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-024-07451-4>

Chen, Chung and Lon-Mu Liu (1993) Joint Estimation of Model Parameters and Outlier Effects in Time Series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* Vol. 88, No. 421 (Mar., 1993), pp 284–297. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2290724>

Sardeshmukh, Prashant D., Gilbert P. Compo and Cécile Penland (2015) Need for Caution in Interpreting Extreme Weather Statistics *Journal of Climate* 28(23) 9166–9187 <https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/28/23/jcli-d-15-0020.1.xml>

Visser, H. and A.C. Petersen (2012) Inferences on weather extremes and weather-related disasters: a review of statistical methods *Climates of the Past* 8, 265–286 <https://cp.copernicus.org/articles/8/265/2012/cp-8-265-2012.pdf>

Miralles, Ophélie and Anthony Davison (2023) Timing and spatial selection bias in rapid extreme event attribution. *Weather and Climate Extremes* 41 100584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2023.100584>

Barlow, Anna Maria, Chris Sherlock and Jonathan Tawn (2020) Inference for Extreme Values Under Threshold-Based Stopping Rules. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C* August 2020, Pages 765–789, <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssc.12420>

Zeder, J., Sippel, S., Pasche, O. C., Engelke, S., & Fischer, E. M. (2023). The effect of a short observational record on the statistics of temperature extremes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL104090. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL104090>

Fleishman, E., editor. (2023). Sixth Oregon Climate Assessment. Oregon Climate Change Research Institute, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. <https://blogs.oregonstate.edu/occri/oregon-climate-assessments> .

McKinnon, K. and I. Simpson (2022) How Unexpected Was the 2021 Pacific Northwest Heatwave? *Geophysical Research Letters*, 49, e2022GL100380. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL100380>

Bercos-Hickey et al. (2022) Anthropogenic Contributions to the 2021 Pacific Northwest Heatwave. *Geophysical Research Letters* 49 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GL099396>

Pielke Jr., Roger (2024) Weather Attribution Alchemy. Substack essay
<https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/weather-attribution-alchemy>

8. Extreme weather in the US and elsewhere

8.1. Introduction

Weather extremes, usually related to temperature and/or precipitation, can disrupt infrastructure and therefore endanger human health and wellbeing. The issue is not whether extremes occur, for they are intrinsic to the chaotic climate system. Rather, it is whether there are long-term (decadal scale) changes in the frequency or character of extremes (“detection”), as well as the extent to which such changes and the attendant changes in hazards are caused by anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases (“attribution”; e.g., IPCC AR6 Seneviratne et al. 2021).

It is naïve to assume that any recent unprecedented extreme event is caused by human influences on the climate. That assumption is wrong in two ways. First, climate is about the statistical properties of weather over decades, not single events. And second, there are only about 130 years of reliable observational records that can be analyzed statistically. That brief interval does not begin to contain all of the extreme events that the climate system can create on its own. Over geologic time the climate system has generated an (essentially) infinite variety of weather patterns and extremes that humans have never observed, and thus are absent from the databases used to determine extreme statistics.³ [see *Perils of short data records* below]. For that reason, attributing an extreme event unprecedented in the record requires assumptions about the magnitude of natural variations.

This is especially true for precipitation events. The hydrological literature has long noted the phenomenon of *Long Term Persistence* (LTP) in rainfall data (Hurst 1951, Cohn and Lins 2005, Markonis and Koutsoyiannis 2015). LTP has a formal mathematical definition but it can be thought of intuitively as the presence of natural variations with strong autocorrelation properties that result in cycle-like behavior on long time scales. The presence of LTP requires long records to accurately estimate variability. Analysis of records short relative to the LTP scale will tend to underestimate variability, therefore overstating the significance of apparent trends and underestimating the likelihood of extreme events (Cohn and Lins 2005).

A good example of LTP is the eight-century long record of the annual minimum height of the Nile River observed at Roda Island in Cairo shown below in Figure 8.1.1. Since human influences on the global climate were negligible before the 20th century, the century-scale variability of the thirty-year average is entirely natural; Egyptians of the seventh and eight centuries would have been incorrect to assume that the worsening drought during that time was the “new normal.”

³ For example, under the simplest statistical assumptions there is a 37 percent chance that a 100-year event is NOT present in a century-long record.




Figure 8.1.1: Nile River discharge [details, source]

With these caveats in mind we examine the evidence for changes in selected weather and climate extremes. It has become routine in media discussions, government and private sector discussions and even in some academic literature to make generalized assertions that extreme weather of all types is getting worse due to GHGs and climate change. Yet expert assessments have not typically drawn such sweeping conclusions and instead have emphasized the difficulty both of identifying specific trends and establishing a causal connection with anthropogenic forcing. For the benefit of readers who may not have read the relevant reports we will begin with extended excerpts of findings from previous IPCC and NCA assessments, then in the remainder of this chapter survey additional data relevant to US and global extreme weather trends.

8.2. Review of IPCC and NCA Findings on Extreme Weather

The sources we review will be denoted as follows:

SREX: The IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (2012)

AR5: The IPCC Fifth Assessment Report Working Group 1 (2013).

AR6: The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report Working Group 1 (2021).

NCA17: The US Climate Science Special Report of the Fourth National Climate Assessment (2017) Volume I Chapter 6.

8.2.1 Overview: IPCC Assessment of signal emergence in extreme weather types

(AR6 WG1 Table 12.12)

Climate Impact Driver Type	Climate Impact Driver Category	Already Emerged in the Historical Record?	Emerging by 2050 in Most Extreme CO2 Emissions Scenario?	Emerging by 2100 in Most Extreme CO2 Emissions Scenario?
Heat & Cold	Average air temperature	YES in most regions	YES	YES
	More heat extremes	YES in most regions	YES in land regions	YES
	Fewer cold extremes	YES in a few regions	YES in many regions	YES
	Less frost	NO	NO	NO
Wet & Dry	Average Precip. (Increase or Decrease)	NO	YES (incr) YES (decr)	YES (incr) YES (decr)
	River flooding	NO	NO	NO
	Heavy precip & pluvial flood	NO	NO	YES in a few regions
	Landslide	NO	NO	NO
	Aridity	NO	NO	NO
	Hydrologic Drought	NO	NO	NO
	Agricultural & ecological drought	NO	NO	NO
	Fire weather	NO	NO	NO
Wind	Average wind speed	NO	NO	NO
	Severe wind storm	NO	NO	NO
	Tropical cyclone	NO	NO	NO
	Sand and dust storm	NO	NO	NO
Snow and Ice	Snow, glacier & ice sheet	NO	YES in a few regions	YES Arctic snow
	Permafrost	YES	YES	YES
	Lake & river ice	NO	YES	YES
	Arctic sea ice	YES	YES	YES
	Antarctic sea ice	NO	YES	YES

	Heavy snowfall and ice storm	NO	NO	NO
	Hail	NO	NO	NO
	Snow avalanche	NO	NO	NO
Coastal	Relative sea level	NO	YES	YES
	Coastal flood	NO	NO	NO
	Coastal erosion	NO	NO	NO
Open Ocean	Average ocean temperature	YES	YES	YES
	Marine heat wave	NO	NO	NO
	Ocean acidity	NO	YES	YES
	Ocean salinity	YES	YES	YES
	Dissolved oxygen	YES (Pacific & S. Ocean)	YES	YES
Other	Air pollution weather	NO	NO	NO
	Solar or IR radiation at surface	NO	NO	NO

Table 8.2.1. IPCC AR6 summary of the probable emergence of an anthropogenic signal above natural climate variability for all global or regional “climate impact drivers” (CIDs) of concern for humans and ecosystems in response to increasing atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations (primarily CO₂). Source: Table adapted from report of Working Group I, Table 12.12). Red = high confidence; yellow = medium confidence; green = no anthropogenic signal detectable above natural variability (50% confidence).

Table 8.2.1 reproduces the findings of AR6 Table 12.12 which indicates, for 34 major weather event and impact types, whether a signal of anthropogenic forcing has been detected in the historical record (column 1), whether such a signal is likely to emerge by 2050 under the extreme RCP8.5 scenario (column 2) and whether it is likely to emerge by 2100 under RCP8.5 forcing (column 3). It should be borne in mind that the latter two columns suffer from the deficiencies of GCMs discussed in Chapter XX. And as we discussed in Ch X on attribution, AR6 offers conflicting messages about attribution of extreme weather. Nevertheless, we provide this Table for reference.

Several patterns stand out. First, detection of an anthropogenic signal is asserted with *high confidence* in only four of the 34 weather impact categories, and with *medium confidence* in a further four. The IPCC

does NOT claim to have detected an anthropogenic signal in the remaining 26 categories. Of the four *high confidence* assertions, two are for changes in average temperatures (air and ocean), which are not measures of extreme weather. Further, two of the four *medium confidence* assertions are related to ocean chemistry and also not related to extreme weather. The IPCC does NOT assert a detectable human influence on many non-temperature weather features such as wind, precipitation, flooding, and drought.

Second, columns 2 and 3 show that the IPCC expects very few anthropogenic trends to emerge within this century, *even under the most extreme forcing scenario*. As we discuss in Section 4.2 the RCP8.5 scenario is an implausible high-end storyline, not a “base case” or “business-as-usual” projection. Even so, most weather impacts are not expected to show an anthropogenic signal this century. Natural variability dominates patterns of extreme weather systems and simplistic assertions of trend detection are frequently undermined by regional heterogeneity and trend reversals over time.

Taking wind as an example, the IPCC claims that an anthropogenic signal has NOT emerged in average wind speeds, severe windstorms, tropical cyclones, or sand and dust storms, and none are expected to emerge this century even under an extreme emissions scenario. The same applies to drought and fire weather. This table alone suffices to illustrate the gap between IPCC expert assessments of extreme weather and discussions in the popular media and political arenas. As we show below the Table reflects longstanding conclusions of the IPCC and other assessment bodies. In the next few sections we will simply present without comment excerpts from past assessment reports.⁴ In selecting these excerpts, we’ve focused on the highest-level summaries to avoid accusations of bias through “cherry picking”.

⁴ In these excerpts we have added **bold-face** emphasis, while *italicized* emphasis on confidence terms appears in the original sources. Citations in quoted text can be found in the underlying reports but are not reproduced here.

8.2.2 Flooding

SREX (p. 176)

In the United States and Canada during the 20th century and in the early 21st century, there is no compelling evidence for climate-driven changes in the magnitude or frequency of floods.

AR5 (p. 214)

AR4 WGI Chapter 3 (Trenberth et al., 2007) did not assess changes in floods but AR4 WGII concluded that **there was not a general global trend in the incidence of floods** (Kundzewicz et al., 2007). SREX went further to suggest that there was low agreement and thus *low confidence* at the global scale regarding changes in the magnitude or frequency of floods or even the sign of changes.

AR5 WGII assesses floods in regional detail accounting for the fact that trends in floods are strongly influenced by changes in river management (see also Section 2.5.2). Although the most evident flood trends appear to be in northern high latitudes, where observed warming trends have been largest, in some regions no evidence of a trend in extreme flooding has been found, for example, over Russia based on daily river discharge (Shklomanov et al., 2007). Other studies for Europe (Hannaford and Marsh, 2008; Renard et al., 2008; Petrow and Merz, 2009; Stahl et al., 2010) and Asia (Jiang et al., 2008; Delgado et al., 2010) show evidence for upward, downward or no trend in the magnitude and frequency of floods, so that there is currently no clear and widespread evidence for observed changes in flooding except for the earlier spring flow in snow-dominated regions (Seneviratne et al., 2012).

In summary, there continues to be a lack of evidence and thus *low confidence* regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency of floods on a global scale.

AR6 (Ch 11 p. 1568)

The SREX (Seneviratne et al., 2012) assessed *low confidence* for observed changes in the magnitude or frequency of floods at the global scale. This assessment was confirmed by the AR5 report (Hartmann et al., 2013). The SR15 (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2018) found increases in flood frequency and extreme streamflow in some regions, but decreases in other regions. **While the number of studies on flood trends has increased since the AR5 report, and there were also new analyses after the release of SR15 (Berghuijs et al., 2017; Blöschl et al., 2019; Gudmundsson et al., 2019), hydrological literature on observed flood changes is heterogeneous, focusing at regional and sub-regional basin scales, making it difficult to synthesise at the global and sometimes regional scales.**

In summary, the seasonality of floods has changed in cold regions where snowmelt dominates the flow regime in response to warming (*high confidence*). **Confidence about peak flow trends over past decades on the global scale is *low*, but there are regions experiencing increases**, including parts of Asia,

southern South America, the northeast USA, northwestern Europe, and the Amazon, **and regions experiencing decreases**, including parts of the Mediterranean, Australia, Africa, and the southwestern USA.

US NCA17 pp. 240-41:

“The IPCC AR5 did not attribute changes in flooding to anthropogenic influence nor report detectable changes in flooding magnitude, duration, or frequency. Trends in extreme high values of streamflow are mixed across the United States. Analysis of 200 U.S. stream gauges indicates areas of both increasing and decreasing flooding magnitude but does not provide robust evidence that these trends are attributable to human influences...

The complex mix of processes complicates the formal attribution of observed flooding trends to anthropogenic climate change and suggests that additional scientific rigor is needed in flood attribution studies. As noted above, precipitation increases have been found to strongly influence changes in flood statistics. However, in U.S. regions, **no formal attribution of precipitation changes to anthropogenic forcing has been made so far, so indirect attribution of flooding changes is not possible. Hence, no formal attribution of observed flooding changes to anthropogenic forcing has been claimed.**”

8.2.3 Heatwaves

AR5 (p. 212 WG1)

Table 2.13 shows that there has been a *likely* increasing trend in the frequency of heatwaves since the middle of the 20th century in Europe and Australia and across much of Asia where there are sufficient data. However, confidence on a global scale is *medium* owing to lack of studies over Africa and South America but also in part owing to differences in trends depending on how heatwaves are defined (Perkins et al., 2012). Using monthly means as a proxy for heatwaves Coumou et al. (2013) and Hansen et al. (2012) indicate that record-breaking temperatures in recent decades substantially exceed what would be expected by chance but caution is required when making inferences between these studies and those that deal with multi-day events and/ or use more complex definitions for heatwave events. **There is also evidence in some regions that periods prior to the 1950s had more heatwaves (e.g., over the USA, the decade of the 1930s stands out and is also associated with extreme drought conditions** (Peterson et al., 2013) whereas conversely in other regions heatwave trends may have been underestimated owing to poor quality and/or consistency of data (e.g., Della-Marta et al. (2007a) over Western Europe; Kuglitsch et al. (2009, 2010) over the Mediterranean). Recent available studies also suggest that the number of cold spells has reduced significantly since the 1950s (Donat et al., 2013a, 2013c).

In summary, new analyses continue to support the AR4 and SREX conclusions that since about 1950 it is *very likely* that the numbers of cold days and nights have decreased and the numbers of warm days and

nights have increased overall on the global scale, that is, for land areas with sufficient data. It is *likely* that such changes have also occurred across most of North America, Europe, Asia and Australia.

NCA17 (pp. 190-191)

Changes in warm extremes are more nuanced than changes in cold extremes. For instance, the warmest daily temperature of the year increased in some parts of the West over the past century (Figure 6.3), but there were decreases in almost all locations east of the Rocky Mountains. In fact, all eastern regions experienced a net decrease (Table 6.2), most notably the Midwest (about 2.2°F [1.2°C]) and the Southeast (roughly 1.5°F [0.8°C]). The decreases in the eastern half of [the] Nation, particularly in the Great Plains, are mainly tied to the unprecedented summer heat of the 1930s Dust Bowl era, which was exacerbated by land-surface feedbacks driven by springtime precipitation deficits and land mismanagement. However, anthropogenic aerosol forcing may also have reduced summer temperatures in the Northeast and Southeast from the early 1950s to the mid-1970s, and agricultural intensification may have suppressed the hottest extremes in the Midwest.

Since the mid-1960s, there has been only a very slight increase in the warmest daily temperature of the year (amidst large interannual variability). **Heat waves (6-day periods with a maximum temperature above the 90th percentile for 1961–1990) increased in frequency until the mid-1930s, became considerably less common through the mid-1960s, and increased in frequency again thereafter (Figure 6.4). As with warm daily temperatures, heat wave magnitude reached a maximum in the 1930s.**




Figure 8.2.1: US Heat waves since 1900. Source: NCA17 Figure 6.4

AR6 (p. 1550)

In North America (Table 11.19), there is very robust evidence for a *very likely* increase in the intensity and frequency of hot extremes and decrease in the intensity and frequency of cold extremes for the whole continent, though there are substantial spatial and seasonal variations in the trends. Minimum temperatures display warming consistently across the continent, **while there are more contrasting trends in the annual maximum daily temperatures** in parts of the USA (Figure 11.9; Lee et al., 2014; van Oldenborgh et al., 2019; Dunn et al., 2020).

8.2.4 Extreme snowfall events

Note: extreme snowfall events in the US northeast are assessed in relation to winter Extratropical Cyclone (ETC) activity.

AR6 Ch 11. p. 1593

There is *high confidence* that snowfall associated with winter ETCs will decrease in the future, because increases in tropospheric temperatures lead to a lower proportion of precipitation falling as snow (O’Gorman, 2014; Rhoades et al., 2018; Zarzycki, 2018). However, there is *medium confidence* that extreme snowfall events associated with winter ETCs will change little in regions where snowfall will be supported in the future (O’Gorman, 2014; Zarzycki, 2018).

8.2.5 Extreme precipitation

SREX (p. 142)

Recent studies have updated the assessment of the AR4, with more regional results now available (Table 3-2). Overall, this additional evidence confirms that **more locations and studies show an increase than a decrease in extreme precipitation, but that there are also wide regional and seasonal variations**, and trends in many regions are not statistically significant (Table 3-2)... Based on station data from Canada, the United States, and Mexico, Peterson et al. (2008a) reported that heavy precipitation has been increasing over 1950-2004, as well as the average amount of precipitation falling on days with precipitation.

AR5 (pp. 213-14)

In summary, further analyses continue to support the AR4 and SREX conclusions that it is *likely* that since 1951 there have been statistically significant increases in the number of heavy precipitation events (e.g., above the 95th percentile) in more regions than there have been statistically significant decreases, but

there are strong regional and subregional variations in the trends. In particular, many regions present statistically non-significant or negative trends, and, where seasonal changes have been assessed, there are also variations between seasons (e.g., more consistent trends in winter than in summer in Europe). The overall most consistent trends towards heavier precipitation events are found in central North America (very likely increase) but assessment for Europe shows likely increases in more regions than decreases.

AR6 (p. 1560)

In North America, there is robust evidence that the magnitude and intensity of extreme precipitation has *very likely* increased since the 1950s. Both [one-day maxima] and [5-day maxima] have significantly increased in North America during 1950-2018 (Sun et al., 2020, also Figure 11.13). There is, however, regional diversity. In Canada, there is a lack of detectable trends in observed annual maximum daily (or shorter duration) precipitation (Shephard et al., 2014; Mekis et al., 2015; Vincent et al., 2018).

NCA17 pp. 213-14:

Detectability of trends (compared to internal variability) for a number of precipitation metrics over the continental United States has been examined; **however, trends identified for the U.S. regions have not been clearly attributed to anthropogenic forcing.** One study concluded that increasing precipitation trends in some north-central U.S. regions and the extreme annual anomalies there in 2013 were at least partly attributable to the combination of anthropogenic and natural forcing... **Based on current evidence, it is concluded that detectable but not attributable increases in mean precipitation have occurred over parts of the central United States.** Formal detection-attribution studies indicate a human contribution to extreme precipitation increases over the continental United States, but confidence is *low* based on those studies alone due to the short observational period, high natural variability, and model uncertainty.

In summary, based on available studies, it is concluded that for the continental United States there is *high confidence* in the detection of extreme precipitation increases, while there is *low confidence* in attributing the extreme precipitation changes purely to anthropogenic forcing.

8.2.6 Tornadoes and severe convective storms

IPCC AR6 Sct. 11.7.3, p. 1594

Severe convective storms are convective systems that are associated with extreme phenomena such as tornadoes, hail, heavy precipitation (rain or snow), strong winds, and lightning.

The assessment of changes in severe convective storms in SREX (Chapter 3, Seneviratne et al., 2012) and AR5 (Chapter 12, Collins et al., 2013) is limited and focused mainly on tornadoes and hail storms. The

SREX assessed that **there is low confidence in observed trends in tornadoes and hail** because of data inhomogeneities and inadequacies in monitoring systems. Subsequent literature assessed in the Climate Science Special Report (Kossin et al., 2017) led to the assessment of the observed tornado activity over the 2000s in the USA, with a decrease in the number of days per year with tornadoes and an increase in the number of tornadoes on these days (*medium confidence*). However, **there is low confidence in past trends for hail and severe thunderstorm winds**. Climate models consistently project environmental changes that would support an increase in the frequency and intensity of severe thunderstorms that combine tornadoes, hail, and winds (*high confidence*), but there is *low confidence* in the details of the projected increase.

... In summary, because the definition of severe convective storms varies depending on the literature and the region, it is not straightforward to make a synthesizing view of observed trends in severe convective storms in different regions. In particular, **observational trends in tornadoes, hail, and lightning associated with severe convective storms are not robustly detected** due to insufficient coverage of the long-term observations. There is *medium confidence* that the mean annual number of tornadoes in the USA has remained relatively constant, but their variability of occurrence has increased since the 1970s, particularly over the 2000s, with **a decrease in the number of days per year, and an increase in the number of tornadoes on these days** (*high confidence*). Detected tornadoes have also increased in Europe, but the trend depends on the density of observations.

... In summary, **it is extremely difficult to detect and attribute changes in severe convective storms**. There is limited evidence that extreme precipitation associated with severe convective storms has increased in some cases.

8.2.7 Hurricanes and Tropical Cyclones

SREX (p. 159):

There have been no significant trends observed in global tropical cyclone frequency records, including over the present 40-year period of satellite observations (e.g., Webster et al., 2005). Regional trends in tropical cyclone frequency have been identified in the North Atlantic, but the fidelity of these trends is debated (Holland and Webster, 2007; Landsea, 2007; Mann et al., 2007a). Different methods for estimating undercounts in the earlier part of the North Atlantic tropical cyclone record provide mixed conclusions (Chang and Guo, 2007; Mann et al., 2007b; Kunkel et al., 2008; Vecchi and Knutson, 2008). Regional trends have not been detected in other oceans (Chan and Xu, 2009; Kubota and Chan, 2009; Callaghan and Power, 2011). It thus remains uncertain whether any observed increases in tropical cyclone frequency on time scales longer than about 40 years are robust, after accounting for past changes in observing capabilities (Knutson et al., 2010).

AR5 (pp. 216-17):

Current data sets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century and it remains uncertain whether any reported long-term increases in tropical cyclone frequency are robust, after accounting for past changes in observing capabilities (Knutson et al., 2010). **No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricanes counts have been identified** over the past 100 years in the North Atlantic basin. Measures of land-falling tropical cyclone frequency (Figure 2.34) are generally considered to be more reliable than counts of all storms which tend to be strongly influenced by those that are weak and/or short lived. Callaghan and Power (2011) find a statistically significant decrease in Eastern Australia land-falling tropical cyclones since the late 19th century although including 2010/2011 season data this trend becomes non-significant (i.e., a trend of zero lies just inside the 90% confidence interval). Significant trends are not found in other oceans on shorter time scales (Chan and Xu, 2009; Kubota and Chan, 2009; Mohapatra et al., 2011; Weinkle et al., 2012), although Grinsted et al. (2012) find a significant positive trend in eastern USA using tide-gauge data from 1923–2008 as a proxy for storm surges associated with land-falling hurricanes. Differences between tropical cyclone studies highlight the challenges that still lie ahead in assessing long-term trends.

In summary, this assessment does not revise the SREX conclusion of *low confidence* that any reported long-term (centennial) increases in tropical cyclone activity are robust, after accounting for past changes in observing capabilities. More recent assessments indicate that **it is unlikely that annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricanes counts have increased over the past 100 years in the North Atlantic basin**. Evidence, however, is for a virtually certain increase in the frequency and intensity of the strongest tropical cyclones since the 1970s in that region.

AR6 (p. 1585)

There is *low confidence* in most reported long-term (multidecadal to centennial) trends in TC frequency- or intensity-based metrics due to changes in the technology used to collect the best-track data. This should not be interpreted as implying that no physical (real) trends exist, but rather as indicating that either the quality or the temporal length of the data is not adequate to provide robust trend detection statements, particularly in the presence of multidecadal variability.

There are previous and ongoing efforts to homogenize the best-track data (Elsner et al., 2008; Kossin et al., 2013, 2020; Choy et al., 2015; Landsea, 2015; Emanuel et al., 2018) and there is substantial literature that finds positive trends in intensity-related metrics in the best-track during the “satellite period”, which is generally limited to the past ~40 years (Kang and Elsner, 2012; Kishtawal et al., 2012; Kossin et al., 2013, 2020; Mei and Xie, 2016; Zhao et al., 2018; Tauvale and Tsuboki, 2019). **When best-track trends are tested using homogenized data, the intensity trends generally remain positive, but are smaller in amplitude** (Kossin et al., 2013; Holland and Bruyère, 2014). **Kossin et al. (2020) extended the homogenized TC intensity record to the period 1979–2017 and identified significant global increases in major TC exceedance probability of about 6% per decade.**⁵ In addition to trends in TC intensity, there is

⁵ The **underlined** text referenced a study (Kossin et al. 2020) that later retracted a portion of its findings. Those authors assembled a data set on global TC incidence spanning 1979 to 2017 from which they claimed that the global fraction of TCs reaching major status (Cat 3–5) rose from 27% during 1979–1997

evidence that TC intensification rates and the frequency of rapid intensification events have increased within the satellite era (Kishtawal et al. 2012; Balaguru et al., 2018; Bhatia et al., 2018). The increase in intensification rates is found in the best-track as well as the homogenized intensity data.

A subset of the best-track data corresponding to hurricanes that have directly impacted the United States since 1900 is considered to be reliable, and shows no trend in the frequency of U.S. landfall events (Knutson et al., 2019).

8.2.8 Droughts

US NCA17 REPORT (Ch. 8, Wehner et al. 2017)

p. 231:

Recent droughts and associated heat waves have reached record intensity in some regions of the United States; however, by geographical scale and duration, the Dust Bowl era of the 1930s remains the benchmark drought and extreme heat event in the historical record (very high confidence). **While by some measures drought has decreased over much of the continental United States in association with long-term increases in precipitation, neither the precipitation increases nor inferred drought decreases have been confidently attributed to anthropogenic forcing.**

The human effect on recent major U.S. droughts is complicated. Little evidence is found for a human influence on observed precipitation deficits, but much evidence is found for a human influence on surface soil moisture deficits due to increased evapotranspiration caused by higher temperatures. (*High confidence*)

p. 233:

Drought is, of course, directly connected to seasonal precipitation totals. Figure 7.1 shows detectable observed recent changes in seasonal precipitation. In fact, the increases in observed summer and fall precipitation are at odds with the projections in Figure 7.5. **As a consequence of this increased precipitation, drought statistics over the entire CONUS have declined.**

to 31% during 1998-2017 and that the increase was statistically significant. However, closer examination of their results showed a significant increase only in the North Atlantic (18% to 34%) whereas changes in all other basins (Eastern Pacific, Western Pacific, North Indian, South Indian, South Pacific) were not statistically significant. In a subsequent correction (<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2021573117>), Kossin et al. stated that the global probability of observing a major TC rose from 34% during 1979-1997 to 37% in the later period and that the evidence for statistical significance was now weaker. Nevertheless, the authors claimed that the correction did not affect their conclusions.

SREX (p. 170)

From a paleoclimate perspective recent droughts are not unprecedented, with severe ‘megadroughts’ reported in the paleoclimatic record for Europe, North America, and Australia (Jansen et al., 2007). Recent studies extend this observation to African and Indian droughts (Sinha et al., 2007; Shanahan et al., 2009): much more severe and longer droughts occurred in the past centuries with widespread ecological, political, and socioeconomic consequences. Overall, these studies confirm that in the last millennium several extreme droughts have occurred (Breda and Badeau, 2008; Kallis, 2008; Büntgen et al., 2010).

In North America, there is *medium confidence* that there has been an overall slight tendency toward less dryness (wetting trend with more soil moisture and runoff; Table 3-2), although analyses for some subregions also indicate tendencies toward increasing dryness. This assessment is based on several lines of evidence, including simulations with different hydrological models as well as PDSI and CDD estimates (Alexander et al., 2006; Andreadis and Lettenmaier, 2006; van der Schrier et al., 2006a; Kunkel et al., 2008; Sheffield and Wood, 2008a; Dai, 2011).

The most severe droughts in the 20th century have occurred in the 1930s and 1950s, where the 1930s Dust Bowl was most intense and the 1950s drought most persistent (Andreadis et al., 2005) in the United States, while in Mexico the 1950s and late 1990s were the driest periods. Recent regional trends toward more severe drought conditions were identified over southern and western Canada, Alaska, and Mexico, with subregional exceptions (Dai, 2011).

SREX (p. 172)

Overall, though new studies have furthered the understanding of the mechanisms leading to drought, there is still relatively limited evidence to provide an attribution of observed changes, in particular given the issues associated with the availability of observational data (Section 3.2.1) and the definition and computation of drought indicators (Box 3-3). This latter point was mostly identified in post-AR4 studies (Box 3-3). Moreover, regions where consistent increases in drought are identified (see ‘Observed Changes’) are only partly consistent with those where projections indicate an enhancement of drought conditions in coming decades (see next paragraphs). We thus assess that there is *medium confidence* (see also Section 3.1.5) that anthropogenic influence has contributed to some changes in the drought patterns observed in the second half of the 20th century, based on its attributed impact on precipitation and temperature changes (though temperature can only be indirectly related to drought trends; see Box 3-3). However there is *low confidence* in the attribution of changes in droughts at the level of individual regions.

AR5 (pp. 214-215)

Based on evidence since AR4, SREX concluded that there were not enough direct observations of dryness to suggest high confidence in observed trends globally, although there was *medium confidence* that since the 1950s some regions of the world have experienced more intense and longer droughts. The

differences between AR4 and SREX are due primarily to analyses post-AR4, differences in how both assessments considered drought and updated IPCC uncertainty guidance.

Because drought is a complex variable and can at best be incompletely represented by commonly used drought indices, discrepancies in the interpretation of changes can result. For example, Sheffield and Wood (2008) found decreasing trends in the duration, intensity and severity of drought globally. Conversely, Dai (2011a,b) found a general global increase in drought, although with substantial regional variation and individual events dominating trend signatures in some regions (e.g., the 1970s prolonged Sahel drought and the 1930s drought in the USA and Canadian Prairies). Studies subsequent to these continue to provide somewhat different conclusions on trends in global droughts and/or dryness since the middle of the 20th century (Sheffield et al., 2012; Dai, 2013; Donat et al., 2013c; van der Schrier et al., 2013).

In summary, the current assessment concludes that there is not enough evidence at present to suggest more than *low confidence* in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, geographical inconsistencies in the trends, and dependencies of inferred trends on the index choice. Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated. However, it is *likely* that the frequency and intensity of drought has increased in the Mediterranean and West Africa and decreased in central North America and north-west Australia since 1950.

AR6 (Drought, Observed trends, Section 11.6.2, pp. 1573-75)

p. 1573

Strong precipitation deficits have been recorded in recent decades in the Amazon (2005, 2010), south-western China (2009–2010), south-western North America (2011–2014), Australia (1997–2009), California (2014), the middle East (2012–2016), Chile (2010–2015), the Great Horn of Africa (2011), among others (van Dijk et al., 2013; Mann and Gleick, 2015; Rowell et al., 2015; Marengo and Espinoza, 2016; Dai and Zhao, 2017; Garreaud et al., 2017, 2020; Marengo et al., 2017; Brito et al., 2018; Cook et al., 2018). **Global studies generally show no significant trends in SPI time series** (Orlowsky and Seneviratne, 2013; Spinoni et al., 2014), **and in derived drought frequency and severity data** (Spinoni et al., 2019), with very few regional exceptions (Section 11.9 and Figure 11.17).

p. 1574

For AR6 regions, several studies suggest an increase in the frequency and areal extent of soil moisture deficits, with examples in East Asia (Cheng et al., 2015; Y. Qin et al., 2015; Jia et al., 2018), Western and Central Europe (Trnka et al., 2015b), and the Mediterranean (Hanel et al., 2018; Moravec et al., 2019; Markonis et al., 2021). **Nonetheless, some analyses also show no long-term trends in soil drying in**

some AR6 regions – for example, in Eastern North America (Park Williams et al., 2017) and Central North America (Seager et al., 2019), as well as in North Eastern Africa (Kew et al., 2021).

There is evidence based on streamflow records of increased hydrological droughts in East Asia (D. Zhang et al., 2018) and southern Africa (Gudmundsson et al., 2019). **In areas of Western and Central Europe and Northern Europe, there is no evidence of changes in the severity of hydrological droughts since 1950** based on flow reconstructions (Caillouet et al., 2017; Barker et al., 2019) and observations (Vicente-Serrano et al., 2019). **In North America, depending on the methods, datasets and study periods, there are differences between studies that suggest an increase (Shukla et al., 2015; Udall and Overpeck, 2017) versus a decrease in hydrological drought frequency (Mo and Lettenmaier, 2018), but in general there is strong spatial variability** (Poshtiri and Pal, 2016). Streamflow observation reference networks of near-natural catchments have also been used to isolate the effect of climate trends on hydrological drought trends in a few regions, but these show limited trends in Northern Europe and Western and Central Europe (Stahl et al., 2010; Bard et al., 2015; Harrigan et al., 2018), North America (Dudley et al., 2020) and most of Australia, with the exception of Eastern and Southern Australia (X.S. Zhang et al., 2016).

p. 1575

Few AR6 regions show observed increases in meteorological drought (Section 11.9), mostly in Africa and South America (NES: *high confidence*; WAF, CAF, ESAF, SAM, SWS, SSA, SAS: *medium confidence*); a few others show a decrease (WSB, ESB, NAU, CAU, NEU, CNA: *medium confidence*). There are stronger signals indicating observed increases in agricultural and ecological drought (Section 11.9), which highlights the role of increased [evapotranspiration], driven by increased [Atmospheric Evaporative Demand], for these trends (Sections 11.6.2.3, 11.6.2.5). Past increases in agricultural and ecological droughts are found on all continents and several regions (WAF, CAF, WSAF, ESAF, WCA, ECA, EAS, SAU, MED, WCE, NES: *medium confidence*), while decreases are found only in one AR6 region (NAU: *medium confidence*). The more limited availability of datasets makes it more difficult to assess historical trends in hydrological drought at regional scale (Section 11.9). Increasing (MED: *high confidence*; WAF, EAS, SAU: *medium confidence*) and decreasing (NEU, SES: *medium confidence*) trends in hydrological droughts have only been observed in a few regions.

AR6 on Attribution (p. 1577)

There are only two AR6 regions in which there is at least *medium confidence* that human-induced climate change has contributed to changes in meteorological droughts (Section 11.9). In South-western South America (SSW), there is *medium confidence* that human-induced climate change has contributed to an increase in meteorological droughts (Boisier et al., 2016; Garreaud et al., 2020), while in Northern Europe (NEU), there is *medium confidence* that it has contributed to a decrease in meteorological droughts (Gudmundsson and Seneviratne, 2016) (Section 11.9). **In other AR6 regions, there is inconclusive evidence in the attribution of long-term trends, but a human contribution to single meteorological events or subregional trends has been identified in some instances... In North America,**

the human influence on precipitation deficits is complex (Wehner et al., 2017), with low confidence in the attribution of long-term changes in meteorological drought in AR6 regions.

8.3. Extreme weather trends at global and continental scale

8.3.1 Tropical Cyclones (TCs)

Hurricane strength records for the North Atlantic and the Western Pacific go back to 1950 and the record does not show an increase in either total or major TCs. Figure 8.3.1 was published by Roger Pielke Jr. as an update to the Best Track data series originally presented in Weinkle et al. (2012).




Figure 8.3.1. Tropical Cyclone Landfalls. Source: <https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/global-tropical-cyclones>, Weinkle et al. (2012)

Similarly, Figure 8.3.2 (Maue 2025, <https://climatlas.com/tropical/>) shows that both all hurricanes and major hurricanes have not become more common since 1980, the period of rapidly growing human influences. In fact, both numbers have trended down slightly since the 1990s:




Figure 8.3.2: Global hurricane frequency. Source: Maue (2025)

A metric that combines the number, duration, and strength of TCs is the Accumulated Cyclone Energy (ACE) Index maintained at Colorado State University, shown in Figure 8.3.3. It clearly shows no long-term increase, in fact declining slightly since 1990.




Figure 8.3.3: Global Accumulated Cyclone Energy. Source: Klotzbach (2025)

<https://tropical.atmos.colostate.edu/Realtime/index.php?arch&loc=global>

Note that Tu et al. (2024) report that the Power Dissipation Index (PDI), another different measure that combines hurricane number, duration, and strength, has either remained unchanged or has declined in all global oceanic basins since the mid-1990s.

Today's global climate simulations are too coarse to project changes in TCs directly. Rather, projections are derived from finer "downscaled" simulations or proxies involving sea surface temperatures, winds, and aerosols. By those methods, a warming climate is expected to show declining hurricane formation rates. (Chand et al. 2022). Climate models also project fewer Tropical Cyclones under future global warming, and even though models project they will increase in strength, the annual averages of rainfall maxima decline (Stansfield et al. 2020).

8.3.2 Wildfires

As shown in Figures 8.3.4 and 8.3.5 global wildfire activity as measured by European Space Agency peaked over a decade ago and shows a downward trend since.




Figure 8.3.4: Global wildfire 1982-2018. Source: Copied from Oton et al. (2021). Note: the different coloured lines represent different data products based on satellites and algorithms used.



Figure 8.3.5: Global wildfire 2001-2018. Source: Copied from Lizundia-Loiola et al. (2021). Note: the different coloured lines represent different data products based on satellites and algorithms used

US data from the National Interagency Fire Centre (NIFC) from 1926 to 2023 are shown in Figure 8.3.6.




Figure 8.3.6: US wildfires 1926 to 2023. Source: National InterAgency Fire Centre data

Pre-2017 (archived)

https://web.archive.org/web/20200212033452/https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_stats_totalFires.html. 2018-2023: <https://www.nifc.gov/fire-information/statistics/wildfires>

Note the NIFC has removed the pre-1960 data from its current website. They claim it is because measurement methods changed after 1960. This explanation seems inadequate since agencies blend temperature and extreme weather data series in other contexts when measurement systems changed. In this case if anything the measurement of wildfires has improved since the early 20th century so any bias will be towards understating early wildfire counts. Nonetheless just focusing on the post-1985 interval the number of fires is not increasing. The area burned did increase but only until about 2007.

It is difficult to establish a natural baseline for wildfire activity because of active fire suppression activity since 1900. Paleoclimatic evidence indicates, however, that past wildfire activity was much higher than at present. Marlon et al. (2012) used sedimentary charcoal layers to reconstruct fire history of western US for the past 1400 years. They also fit a model to predict expected fire activity as a function of climatic conditions. The results are summarized in Figure 8.3.7 below (from Figure 2 in their paper).




Figure 8.3.7: Fire frequency and fire deficit in the US. Source: Copied from Marlon et al. (2012)

In their figure the red line shows the smoothed charcoal record and the black dotted line shows the predicted charcoal record based on the statistical model. The gap at the end implies there has been a growing wildfire deficit over the 20th century. In other words, however much fire was observed in the 20th century it was less than what would have been observed in previous centuries based on the climatic conditions. Parks et al. (2025) likewise find that despite the recent increase in wildfire burn area in North America, a significant wildfire deficit remains relative to historical wildfire regimes.

8.3.3 Precipitation

Figure 8.3.8 shows that US long term data from NOAA shows an insignificantly increasing tendency toward extreme wetness (+0.001% per year)




Figure 8.3.8: Long term US wetness (%). Source: NOAA

<https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/uspa/wet-dry/0>

Precipitation will be discussed further in the review of CONUS data below.

8.3.4 Drought

As shown in Figure 8.3.9 US long term data (NOAA) shows an insignificantly declining tendency toward extreme dryness (-0.001% per year)




Figure 8.3.9: US dryness (%) 1895—2023. Source: NOAA
<https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/monitoring/uspa/wet-dry/0>

Kogan et al. (2020) examines a 38-year high-resolution satellite-based drought measure and concludes that global drought has not intensified and is not connected to climate change: “it is possible to state firmly that global and main grain countries’ drought area and intensity trends have not been following global climate warming since 1980’s.”

8.4. Temperature and precipitation extremes in the Contiguous US (CONUS)

8.4.1 CONUS daily temperatures are becoming less extreme

Daily maximum temperatures in the warm season (TMax, May-Sep) and daily minimum temperatures in the cold season (TMin, Dec-Mar) are available beginning in Dec 1898 (126 years). The dataset consists of 1,211 CONUS stations designated as United States Historical Climate Network or USHCN stations (Quinlan et al. 1987, Karl et al. 1990). These stations were selected by NOAA as having the fewest problematic issues with gaps, station moves and instrument changes. Where gaps still exist, nearby stations (bias-corrected) were merged so that the median volume of data available for a station is 98%. Although there are certainly errors in the dataset, with over 1,000 stations we can have relatively high confidence in any underlying signal that might be discovered.

We begin with the question of whether the occurrence of daily record high or low temperatures changed has changed since Dec 1898. Each warm-season has 153 days (1 May to 30 Sep) and each cold-season has 122 days (1 Dec to 31 Mar). For each station and day, we calculated the year in which the record highest (lowest) temperature occurred. With 126 years of observations, if there were no temperature trends over time, the expected number of records for TMax would be 1.21 (=153/126) per station per year and for TMin 0.96 (=122/126) per station per year. Figure 8.4.1 indicates the observed distribution in time of the occurrence of these extreme events.




Figure 8.4.1 Number of daily record High (red) and Low (blue) for warm and cold seasons in the CONUS. The lines represent the 15-year running, centered average. Source: 1,211 USHCN stations supplemented as needed to achieve a minimum of 92% of observations in the 126-year period since Dec 1898.

The results indicate a common feature in many metrics of warm-season extremes in the CONUS - the exceptional heat of the 1920s and especially the 1930s, peaking in 1936. On a per-station average, 60% of the TMax records and 59% of the TMin records occurred in the first half of the period (1899-1961).

On the cold side, the Valentine's Day Arctic outbreak in Feb 1899 stands as the most extensive cold extreme experienced by the CONUS, with 1917 2nd. The frequency of cold records has declined, especially over the last quarter of the period in which only 13% of the extreme cold events were measured. In contrast, 25% of the extreme TMax records were achieved in the last quarter in accordance with statistical expectations. These general features have been noted in past assessments (IPCC AR5, IPCC AR6, NCA4, NCA5). Combining the two records the overall reduction in numbers of both cold and hot extremes over the past century indicates a climate less prone to extremes.

This pattern is also shown in Figure 8.4.2. For each station and for each year the hottest warm season and coldest cold-season temperatures were calculated and converted to anomalies relative to the station's long term warm and cold season (respectively) averages. Then the differences between these were computed by station and geographically-averaged over all stations, thus yielding an annual measure of the expected range of local extreme temperatures for each year. Figure 8.11 shows the 15-year trailing average of this measure which has clearly declined over the past century.




Figure 8.4.2. 15-year trailing average of the difference each year of each station's hottest warm-season TMax and coldest cold-season TMin relative to the long-term average.

The average difference for each station between the hottest summer TMax and coldest winter TMin has declined about 5°F in the past 126 years. The decline is due mostly to warming winter TMin, but a decline in the magnitude of summer TMax is also a factor. The rise in TMin has been strongly related to the growing presence of manufactured surfaces around the weather stations over the last 100+ years (Spencer et al. 2025).

Summarizing Figures 8.4.1 and 8.4.2, while temperature extremes are regularly experienced in the US and attract a great deal of media attention, long term records show the US climate has become less extreme over time (milder) when measured in terms of the range between warm season maxima and cold season minima.

8.4.2 Exceedances of a heat threshold

Under the heading of “The Risk of Temperature Extremes is Changing”, the most recent US National Climate Assessment report (NCA5) notes the increase in a threshold metric of number of days at or above 95°F, stating,

“The western US has been particularly affected by extreme heat since the 1980s ..., experiencing a larger increase in days over 95°F, as would be expected given the greater warming in that region relative to the eastern US. Several major heatwaves have affected the US since 2018, including a record-shattering event in the Pacific Northwest in 2021.”

Are the occurrences of 95°F days changing? In a climate as varied as that of CONUS, threshold statistics can be misleading. A region with many stations that have near 95°F TMax average temperatures in the summer might see large swings in the metric when only small changes in average temperature occur. Elsewhere with stations that either rarely or virtually always achieve 95°F TMax temperatures, a small change will not impact the results much at all. In the past 126 years, the average CONUS station experienced 129 days exceeding 95°F per 6-yr period, but the regional values range from 278 in the Southern Plains to 9 in the Northeast. Thus, one needs to view such threshold analyses with caution.




Figure 8.4.3. Total number of days $\geq 95^{\circ}\text{F}$ in 6-yr periods, US 48 (bars) and regions (lines).

In Fig. 8.4.3 we see that only three of the nine regions, all in the West, have experienced upward trends in the number of 95°F or hotter days (dashed lines). The CONUS as a whole has not and the other six regions have experienced declines.

The Pacific NW heatwave of 2021 is referenced as of the NCA5 claim, an event we examine more closely in Section 6.4. The evidence indicates it was a “black swan” event; *i.e.*, a single, unprecedented event in the record, not part of a pattern of increasing extreme heat. For example, the 5-day average tropospheric grid-point temperature anomaly over the Pacific NW during that event was +10.8 C, the most extreme NH grid point summer anomaly in the 46 years from over 4 million grids. In contrast, the global anomaly during that time was virtually zero (+0.03 C, Mass et al. 2024).

The heading “The Risk of Temperature Extremes is Changing” suggests positive trends are now being observed in threshold temperatures on a widespread basis, but that is not evidenced in the combined CONUS results of the figures above.

8.4.3 Heatwaves

Heatwaves (consecutive days that exceed an extreme threshold) have a greater societal impact than a single daily record. We measure “Heatwave Days” here as the count of all days in May-Sep each year that exceed the 90th percentile and that lie within a run of at least six consecutive days. This is equivalent to the method used in NCA5 except that the reference period here is the entire record 1899-2024 while NCA5 truncated the reference period to 1961-1990, a cool time. That truncation boosts positive results (days exceeding the 90th percentile) in periods warmer than the reference period, especially starting in 1960 and moving to the present (see *Urban Influences* below).




Figure 8.4.4 15-year trailing average of number of heatwave days per year per station in the CONUS (bars) and four regions: Pac_SW (purple squares, CA, NV), 4_Crnrs (red squares, AZ,NM,UT,CO), Oh_Vly (blue, MO, IL, KY, TN, IN, OH, WV) and So_East (green, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, NC, VA).

Figure 8.4.4 indicates again the excessive heat of the first half of the 20th century, primarily in the eastern two-thirds of the nation, as seen in the regional values for the Ohio Valley and the Southeast as examples. The West has seen a recent increase of heatwave days and the two regions with the highest number are shown, the Pacific Southwest and the Four-Corners (NCA5). This indicates that

the background warm season circulation favored heatwaves in the eastern portions of the country in the first half of the 20th century, but in the 21st century the patterns have favored heatwaves in the West. For CONUS as a whole, heatwaves are no more common today than they were a century ago.

Of interest here is the regional variation of this metric. The four northern regions (Pacific NW, Northern Plains, Upper Midwest, and Northeast) on average experience 15 to 27 heatwave days per 15-year period. In contrast, the five southern regions (Pacific Southwest, 4-Corners, Southern Plains, Ohio Valley and Southeast) see 37 to 54 such days, essentially twice as many. This suggests the summer circulation pattern is more prone to stationary events in the southern regions while transient systems in the northern regions are more common and thus cut short these potentially longer events.

Urban influences

The NCA5 directs readers to the website <https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves> (USGCRP 2023) to view the number of urban heatwaves by decade from the 1960s. The figure shows a monotonic increase in each decade from 2 occurrences per year in the 1960s to 6 in the 2020s. The definition of a heatwave is an unusual but practical measure of human discomfort - a period of at least 2 consecutive days when the minimum apparent temperature (combination of temperature and humidity) exceeds the 85th percentile. Note too, the dataset is limited to the 50 largest U.S. cities.

These increasing values since 1960 presented in USGCRP (2023) are entirely reasonable, but are unrelated to GHG emissions for at least two reasons. Urbanization in these cities is a major factor in the rise of TMin relative to co-located TMax and relative to TMin at rural stations. Also, the 1960s was the coldest decade and 1970s the second coldest decade since the 1910's, so this starting date preconditions the time series to show increases. This does not dismiss the real rise in nighttime temperatures in major U. S. cities and the societal impacts associated with these changes. However, we note for a variety of reasons, that summer TMax (especially in rural areas) serves as better response variable for detecting potential changes in heatwaves influenced by changes in the background climate due, for example, to increasing GHGs (Christy et al. 2009). For the CONUS as a whole, the evidence in this section suggests GHG emissions have had little-to-no effect on heatwaves.

8.4.4 Extremes in daily precipitation.

Because precipitation involves a discrete phase change (water vapor to liquid), it is stochastic and episodic in character and requires careful statistical treatment to understand variability over long time periods (see *8.1 Introduction*). The US National Climate Assessments (NCA4, NCA5) have highlighted an increase in the occurrence of the heaviest precipitation events (defined in different ways) primarily in the eastern half of the CONUS, especially the Northeast, when starting in either 1901 or 1958. Interestingly, the regional variations indicate that the largest increases in extreme events are in the Northeast and the smallest in the West, a trend counter to the changes in temperature extremes.

McKittrick and Christy (2019) examined long-term and consistent station observations of daily precipitation to test some of these NCA claims for the Southeast and West Coast. When the time series were extended back in time (as far as 1872 in some cases) or when starting later (1978), there were no significant trends for either region. For this report we updated these findings with similarly constructed observations from 29 stations on the Pacific Coast (1893ff from San Diego CA to Blaine WA), 24 stations in the humid Southeast (1872ff from Austin TX to Washington DC), and 21 stations in the Northeast (1888ff from Buffalo NY to Gardiner ME). The results were as follows.

Pacific region:

- Average precipitation trend is significant (downwards) in Astoria, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Big Sur, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Aberdeen and Big Sur and negative and significant in Newport (insignificant elsewhere).
- Averaged over all stations in the region none of these three trend parameters is statistically significant.

Southeast region:

- The trend in average precipitation is positive and significant in Mobile and Quitman, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Mobile, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Vicksburg and Norfolk, insignificant elsewhere.
- Averaged over all stations in the region none of these three trend parameters is statistically significant

Northeast region:

- The trend in average precipitation is positive and significant in 9 of 21 locations and in the region averaged overall.
- The trend in rainfall variance is positive and significant in Portland, Albany and Buffalo, insignificant elsewhere.
- The trend in daily maximum precipitation is positive and significant in Portland and Gardiner, insignificant elsewhere.
- Averaged over all stations in the region the trend parameters for variance and maximum precipitation are not statistically significant.

Pacific Coast heavy rainfall events

The Pacific Coast receives considerable precipitation from Atmospheric River (AR) events which often last more than a day or two (e.g., Gershunov et al. 2017, Pan et al. 2024). The worst-known such event in recent history was the ArkStorm that occurred between December 1861 and January 1862, which dumped nearly 10 feet of rain in parts of California and submerged the entire Central Valley for weeks under as much as 15 feet of water (Brewer 1930, Null and Hulbert 2007). Paleoclimate research has found six megastorms more severe than 1861–1862 in California during the last 1800 years, occurring at intervals of 300 years or so (Porter et al. 2011).

SIDEBAR: Perils of short data records

San Francisco provides a good case study of the limitation of using short historical samples to characterize natural variability of extreme events. Suppose we use a 130-year sample of daily San Francisco precipitation from 1895 to 2024 and we look for 3-day, 5-day, 14-day and 30-day rainfall records. The results are as shown in Table 8.2.

Event	Record (inches)	Year
3-day	6.94	2023
5-day	8.55	2023
14-day	12.62	2023

	30-day	18.93	1998
--	--------	-------	------

Table 8.2: Extreme rainfall records, San Francisco, 1895-2024.

The records all cluster in the more recent data. 2023 appears to be an exceptional year and since it is near the end of the sample it might suggest that the climate has shifted into a more hazardous state, perhaps as a result of human influences.

But the picture is very different if we use a sample that begins 45 years earlier, in 1850. Table 8.3 shows that the record-setting events then all happened in the 1860s. Furthermore 2023 is now not even in 2nd place but falls to 3rd or 4th. Also, comparing the records of the two charts the extreme precipitation events in 1862 and 1867 involved considerably more rainfall than the 1998 and 2023 events, with 14- and 30-day totals about 50 percent higher.

Event	Record (inches)	Year	Rank of 130-yr extreme
3-day	8.85	1867	3
5-day	9.80	1867	3
14-day	19.05	1862	4
30-day	28.25	1862	2

Table 8.3: Extreme rainfall records, San Francisco, 1850-2024.

The range of natural variability is made even more remarkable when paleoclimate evidence is examined. Porter et al. (2011) discovered that in the past 1,800 years at least six megastorms were more intense than the devastating 1861-62 ArkStorm that struck the region. Evidently such extreme events have impacted the region about every 300 years, though not since 1895.

This example illustrates the limitations of using relatively short climate periods (~130 years) to assess the character and range of natural variability in general and of extreme events in particular. Accurate representation of the full range of natural variability is necessary for any attribution analyses (see 6.4). Infrastructure planners, emergency management institutions and attribution scientists would understand the significant mischaracterization of the magnitude of a future extreme if based only on the last 130 years. In this case, a single time-sample of 130 years provides an underestimation of the extreme value by up to 50% determined when adding only 45 more years of observations. Compared to millennial-scale paleoclimate evidence, an even greater underestimation would occur. An important lesson is that the climate can deliver great surprises on its own, even without human influences.

We examine occurrences of 5-day deluges as follows. In a 130-year span there are 26 5-year intervals. At each location we computed the 5-day precipitation totals throughout the year and selected the 26 highest values. A single year may have more than one of the 26 heaviest. Each of those can be thought of as 1-in-5yr events. If there are no trends in precipitation then the total number of these events across all stations should be evenly spread out over the years. In Fig. 8.4.5 we show the distribution in time of these events. The deluges associated with the massive 1997-98 El Niño event are readily apparent. While erratic, as is typical of these types of precipitation metrics, there is no indication of a tendency to become more frequent over time.




Figure 8.4.5. The time distribution by 5-year periods of the 26 heaviest occurrences for each station (i.e., nominal 1-in-5 year event).

Southeast heavy rainfall events

The temporal pattern of 5-day totals of the 1-in-5yr heavy events in the humid Southeast (Figure 8.4.6) is generally unremarkable, though a cluster of higher values appears in 1995 to 2019. The increase in those years is due largely to the 4 northeastern-most stations of Wilmington NC, Weldon NC, Washington DC, and Norfolk VA. This confirms the pattern indicated in NCA4 and NCA5 of a tendency for an increasing frequency of heavy events, due to a temporal clustering of tropical storms from eastern NC to Maine discussed below. Otherwise, the remaining 20 stations show an unremarkable temporal distribution of heavy events.




Figure 8.4.6. As above but for the 30 heaviest 1-in-5yr events for 24 stations in the humid Southeast from Austin TX to Washington DC in 5-year bins for 1875-2024.

Northwest heavy rainfall events

Fig. 8.4.7 shows the 27 (1-in-5yr) heaviest 3-day events for the last 135 years in 21 stations in the Northeast (including Montreal Canada). We use 3-day totals here as this produced the largest variations in time. In this region, 72% of the events occur during June to October and are dominated by tropical incursions of hurricanes, tropical storms or tropical storms that transition to extratropical systems. According to NCA4 and NCA5 this region experienced the largest increases in extreme events, so it shall be examined more closely.




Figure 8.4.7. Time distribution of the heaviest 27 (1-in-5yr) heaviest 3-day precipitation events for 21 stations from NY to ME, including Montreal.

Howarth et al. (2019) report differences in the Northeast between two 18-year periods: 1979-96 and 1997-2014 (a similar region as in Fig. 8.16 that includes PA and NJ) of various precipitation extremes. One metric which indicated a dramatic increase (317%) was found for 24-hr events > 6 inches. This high increase is due to the very small numbers of such events of which there were only 6 in the first period and 25 in the second as reported for 58 stations. This high percentage increase is due to the very small numbers of the events; only 6 in the first period and 25 in the second. Most of the stations, did not record such an event suggesting these erratic, episodic events over brief, 18-yr periods, need scrutiny by additional statistical methods.

Using the information in Fig. 8.4.7 over the same years as Howarth et al. we find a 51% increase in the frequency of heavy events between the two periods. One can see in Fig. 8.16 that it was unfortunate that Howarth et al. ended in 2014 prior to a return to the long-term average of such events.

A feature of Howarth et al. is the use of single day totals which is questionable because extreme events are often spread across the time-of-observation boundary. Thus stations measuring at 0700 LT versus those at Midnight will have differing results for a particular event which would then have major impacts on counting these events. We use the 3-day totals in Fig. 8.4.7 to be sure to capture the extent of these extreme downpours. In any case, we can confirm that the period 1997 to 2014 experienced a cluster of heavier events as Howarth et al. have documented.

Howarth's most remarkable claim (317% increase in 6" days) is potentially misleading because it is a threshold statistic (see Section 8.4.2 above) and a ratio of small numbers over a short period. The result is not representative of *relative* extreme events for the whole region since the majority of stations never experienced a 6" total. Fig. 8.16 above determines the same number of events for each station (27 heaviest events) whose heaviest values ranged from 4.4" to 12.5" and their 27th heaviest values ranged from 3.3" to 5.0". This analysis thus allows each station to be equally represented. In

other words, if there is a region-wide increase in heavy events, it should be seen in the sum of all stations. Note too that the period of record here is 135 years vs. 36 years of Howarth et al. Except for three 5-year periods between 1995 and 2014 there is nothing statistically remarkable about the results in Fig. 8.4.7.




Figure 8.4.8. Average amount of precipitation falling in the 1-in-5yr events for the NE stations.

An interesting aspect of Northeast precipitation is that there has been no change in the amount of precipitation per heaviest event, as shown in Fig. 8.4.8. The trend is only $+0.02''/\text{decade}$. The highest amount, 1935-39, includes the Great New England Hurricane of 1938, one of the rare major (Category 3 or higher) hurricanes to strike the region. The results in Figs. 8.4.6 and 8.4.7 suggest that though there was an uptick in the number of events during the period 1995 to 2014; the events, individually, are not becoming more intense.

Jong et al. (2024) document the increase of tropical influences on precipitation events in the Northeast since 1959 and concluded, "The autumn extreme precipitation trend over the Northeast US is primarily attributed to tropical cyclone-related events since the 1990s." The question then becomes, was the temporal clustering of tropical systems in 1997-2014 which affected the Northeast a response to increasing GHGs? Jong et al. examined CMIP-6 model output which suggests that there will be fewer such systems in the 21st century but that the intensity of the rainfall events might increase. This conjecture is not seen in Fig. 8.17 where the amount-per-event has remained steady over the 135-year period.

For substantial urban areas there is some evidence to indicate the heaviest rainfall events may be redistributed due to the impact urban infrastructure has on the local weather (e.g., Pielke Sr. et al. 2011, Zhang et al. 2018, Yang et al. 2024). Yang et al. state, "Cities that experience compact development tend to witness larger increases in extreme rainfall frequency over downtown than their rural surroundings, while the anomalies in extreme rainfall frequency diminish for cities with

dispersed development.” While this is an important insight to consider, the effect on the specific stations used in this analysis is unknown, or at least not detectable in Fig. 8.17.

In summary, the evidence from the historical record of extreme precipitation events in the CONUS is generally not consistent from region to region so that inferences regarding trends and their projections are wrought with significant uncertainty. In most regions and perhaps all, it is our opinion that the very nature of the erratic and episodic character of extreme precipitation events renders the discovery of statistically significant changes, including a relationship to CO₂ concentrations, a result yet to be achieved (McKittrick and Christy 2019).

8.5 Summary

Based on the content provided in the document, here are the five most important takeaways:

1. Limited Detection of Anthropogenic Signals: The IPCC has asserted high confidence in detecting an anthropogenic signal in only 4 out of 34 weather impact categories, and medium confidence in 4 more. For the remaining 26 categories, no anthropogenic signal is claimed to be detected.
2. Slow Emergence of Trends: Even under the most extreme forcing scenario (RCP8.5), the IPCC expects very few anthropogenic trends to emerge within this century for most weather impacts.
3. Natural Variability Dominance: Natural variability continues to dominate patterns of extreme weather systems. Simple assertions of trend detection are often complicated by regional heterogeneity and trend reversals over time.
4. RCP8.5 Scenario Implausibility: The document notes that the RCP8.5 scenario is described as an implausible high-end storyline, not a "base case" or "business-as-usual" projection.
5. Conflicting Messages on Attribution: The document mentions that AR6 (IPCC Sixth Assessment Report) offers conflicting messages about the attribution of extreme weather to anthropogenic causes, highlighting the complexity and uncertainty in this area of climate science.

These takeaways emphasize the nuanced and complex nature of attributing extreme weather events to climate change, and the importance of considering natural variability and uncertainty in climate projections.

References

Brewer, W., Up and Down California in 1860–1864 The Journal of William H. Brewer (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1930).

Christy, J.R. W. Norris and R.T. McNider, 2009. Surface temperature variations in East Africa and possible causes. *J. Climate*, 22, 3342–3356. DOI: 10.1175/2008JCLI2726.1.

Cohn, Timothy A., Lins, Harry F. (2005). Nature’s style: naturally trendy. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 32. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL024476>.

Gershunov, A. and K. Guirguis, 2012. California heat waves in the present and future. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GL052979>

Gershunov, A., Shulgina, T., Ralph, F. M., Lavers, D. A. & Rutz, J. J. Assessing the climate-scale variability of atmospheric rivers affecting western North America. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **44**, 7900–7908 (2017).

Howarth, M.E., C.D. Thorncroft and L.F. Bosart, 2019, Changes in extreme precipitation in the Northeast United States: 1979-2014. *J. Hydromet.* 20, 673-689. DOI: 10.1175/JHM-D-18-0155.1

Hurst, H. E. (1951), Long term storage capacities of reservoirs, *Trans. Am. Soc. Civ. Eng.*, 116, 776–808.

Jong, B.-T., Murakami, H., Delworth, T. L., & Cooke, W. F. (2024). Contributions of tropical cyclones and atmospheric rivers to extreme precipitation trends over the Northeast US. *Earth's Future*, 12, e2023EF004370. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023EF004370>

Karl, T.R., C.N. Williams, Jr., F.T. Quinlan, and T.A. Boden, 1990: United States Historical Climatology Network (HCN) Serial Temperature and Precipitation Data, Environmental Science Division, Publication No. 3404, Carbon Dioxide Information and Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 389 pp.

Markonis, Yannis, Koutsoyiannis, Demetris (2016). Scale-dependence of persistence in precipitation records. *Nat. Clim. Change* 6, 399–401.

Mass, C., D. Owens, J. Christy, and R. Conrick, **2024**: The Pacific Northwest heat wave of 25-30 June 2021: Synoptic/Mesoscale conditions and climate perspective. *Weather and Forecasting*, 39. DOI: 10.1175/WAF-D-23-0154.1.

McKittrick, R. and J.R. Christy, **2019**: Assessing changes in US regional precipitation on multiple time scales. *J. Hydro.* 578, (2019), DOI.ORG/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124074

Overland, J. E., 2021: Causes of the record-breaking Pacific Northwest heatwave, late June 2021. *Atmosphere*, **12**, 1434, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12111434>.

NCA4, Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume I, 2017. Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey and K.A. Hibbard .eds. U.S. Global Change Research Program. Washington DC, USA. doi: 10.7930/J0J964J6. <https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/19486>

NCA5, Fifth National Climate Assessment. Crimmins, A.R., C.W. Avery, D.R. Easterling, K.E. Kunkel, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock, Eds. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA. <https://doi.org/10.7930/NCA5.2023.CH1>.

Null, J. and J. Hulbert, “California Washed Away: The Great Flood of 1862,” *Weatherwise* 60, no. 1 (2007): 26–30, <https://doi.org/10.3200/wewi.60.1.26-30>.

Pan, M., M. Lu and U. Lall, 2024: Diversity of cross-Pacific atmospheric river main routes. *Nature Com. Earth & Envi.* 5., 378. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01552-y>

Philip, S. Y., Kew, S. F., van Oldenborgh, G. J., Anslow, F. S., Seneviratne, S. I., Vautard, R., Coumou, D., Ebi, K. L., Arrighi, J., Singh, R., van Aalst, M., Pereira Marghidan, C., Wehner, M., Yang, W., Li, S., Schumacher, D. L., Hauser, M., Bonnet, R., Luu, L. N., Lehner, F., Gillett, N., Tradowsky, J. S., Vecchi, G. A., Rodell, C., Stull, R. B., Howard, R., and Otto, F. E. L.: Rapid attribution analysis of the extraordinary heat wave on the Pacific coast of the US and Canada in June 2021, *Earth Syst. Dynam.*, 13, 1689–1713, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-13-1689-2022>, 2022.

Porter, K. et al., *Overview of the Arkstorm Scenario* (Reston, VA: Dept. of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey, 2011).

Pielke, R. A. et al. Land use/land cover changes and climate: Modeling analysis and observational evidence. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.* **2**, 828–850 (2011).

Quinlan, F. T., T. R. Karl, and C. N. Williams Jr. (1987), United States Historical Climatology Network (USHCN) serial temperature and precipitation data, NDP-019, Carbon Dioxide Inf. Anal. Cent., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., U.S. Dep. of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

USGCRP, 2023: USGCRP Indicators Platform: Heat Waves. U.S. Global Change Research Program. <https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves>

White, R.H., Anderson, S., Booth, J.F. *et al.* The unprecedented Pacific Northwest heatwave of June 2021. *Nat Commun* **14**, 727 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36289-3>

Weinkle, Jessica, Ryan Maue and Roger Pielke Jr. (2012) Historical Global Tropical Cyclone Landfalls *Journal of Climate* 25(13) 4729–4735 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00719.1>

Tu, Shifei, Zhenzhen Hu, Mei Liang, Wen Zhou, Johnny Chan and Jianjun Xu (2024) Decreasing trend in destructive potential of tropical cyclones in the South Indian Ocean since the mid-1990s. *Communications Earth and Environment* 5:543 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-024-01683-2>

Yang, L., Yang, Y., Shen, Y. *et al.* Urban development pattern's influence on extreme rainfall occurrences. *Nat Commun* **15**, 3997 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-48533-5>.

Zhang, W., Villarini, G., Vecchi, G. A. & Smith, J. A. Urbanization exacerbated the rainfall and flooding caused by hurricane Harvey in Houston. *Nature* **563**, 384–388 (2018).

9. Changes in Sea level

Arguably the most important climate impact driver that is unambiguously associated with increasing temperatures is global sea level rise. Global warming increases sea level rise through thermal expansion of the volume of sea water and melting of glaciers and ice sheets. Another factor that influences sea level variations is land water storage. Regional sea level change is influenced by large-scale ocean circulation patterns, and geologic processes and deformation from the redistribution of ice and water. Local sea level rise is further influenced by vertical land motion from geologic processes, ground water withdrawal, and fossil fuel extraction.

The IPCC AR6 estimates that global mean sea level increased by 7.9 (5.9–9.8) inches between 1901 and 2018. The rate of sea level rise has accelerated in recent decades. At the ocean basin scale, sea levels have risen fastest in the Western Pacific and slowest in the Eastern Pacific over the period 1993–2018. The rate of global sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year (for reference: 0.12 in is the height of two stacked pennies).

The observing systems for global sea level rise have advanced significantly in the satellite era, particularly with the advent of satellite altimeters since 1993. Local tide gauges have provided useful data for the past century, and even longer for a few locations. Following the end of the Little Ice Age in the mid-nineteenth century, tide gauges show that the global mean sea level began rising during the period 1820–1860.

9.1. U.S. coastal sea level rise

Observed and predicted rates of mean global sea level rise may have little relevance for specific locations. In Canada and Alaska (and also northern Washington), sea level is actually decreasing, owing to uplift from glacial rebound. Most of the Pacific coast has rates of sea level rise of 0 to 0.12 inches/year. The largest rates of sea level rise are on the Gulf coast (Louisiana and Texas) and in the mid-Atlantic states (Chesapeake Bay region).

Measurements of relative sea level rise from tide gauges conflate the rise in the volume of seawater with local vertical land motion. Hence in examining local sea level changes, it is important to also consider the local vertical land motion. Absolute local sea level rise is the sum of relative sea level rise and the local vertical land motion.

A wide range of processes can cause vertical land motion along the coasts, having amplitudes comparable to the sea level signals expected from land-ice melting or ocean thermal expansion. Vertical land motion on the coasts can locally exacerbate (subsidence/sinking) or mitigate (uplift) the risk of sea level rise. Local changes in sea level vary considerably from place to place and can deviate substantially from the rate of global mean sea level change. Human activities triggering subsidence are soil drainage (e.g. for urban development purposes) or subsurface mining of resources such as groundwater, oil or gas. The magnitude of relative sea level rise caused by human activities is often considerable. Local vertical land motion of relevance to local sea level change is best measured using a Global Positioning System (GPS) station located in the location as the tide gauge.

Table 8.1 shows absolute sea-level rise (ASLR) for selected locations, determined from the sum of uncorrected sea-level rise as estimated from tide gauge time series (RSLR) and the vertical land motion (VLM) measurements. The absolute sea level rise for each of these locations is significantly smaller than the measured relative sea level rise owing to local sinking of the land. More than half of the measured relative sea level rise is attributed to land sinking for these locations: San Francisco, Galveston, Grand Isle. For reference, the global average rate of absolute sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year.

Table 8.1 Absolute sea level rise (inches/year) (RSLR plus VLM)

Location	RSLR	VLM	ASLR
San Francisco, CA	+0.08	-0.06	+0.02
Galveston, TX	+0.26	-0.19	+0.07
Grand Isle, LA	+0.36	-0.28	+0.08
St Petersburg, FL	+0.12	-0.02	+0.10
New York City, NY	+0.11	-0.05	+0.06

San Francisco Bay

Over the past 100 years, relative sea level in the San Francisco Bay area has risen by 7.8 inches, at an average rate of 0.08 inches/year (Figure 8.1). As shown in Table 6.1, San Francisco's vertical land motion is -0.06 inches/year (sinking), producing a recent rate of absolute sea level rise of +0.02 inches/year. Portions of Treasure Island, San Francisco International Airport, and Foster City are sinking as fast as 0.4 inches/year. Landfill zones are sinking due to soil compaction, at a rate as much as one-half inch per year, threatening coastal infrastructure including the San Francisco International Airport. The problems in the San Francisco Bay area have been caused primarily by sinking in landfill regions that were formerly wetlands, not by the slow creep of global sea level rise.




Figure 8.1. Tide gauge measurements at San Francisco, California, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=9414290 (downloaded 4/22/25).

Galveston - Houston

Long-term tide measurements at Galveston Pier 21 show sea level rise of 2.18 feet in the past century, or a rate of 0.26 inches/year (Figure 8.2). Vertical land motion (subsidence) at Galveston is estimated at -0.19 inches/year, yielding a value of absolute sea level rise of +0.07 inches/year (Table 8.1). The U.S. Geologic Survey found that most of the land-surface subsidence in the Houston-Galveston region has occurred as a direct result of groundwater withdrawals.⁶ This caused compaction of the aquifer sediments, mostly in the fine-grained silt and clay layers. By 1979, as much as 10 feet of subsidence had occurred in Houston.

Hurricanes are traditionally the major concern in the region. The 1900 hurricane that struck Galveston and killed between 6,000 and 12,000 people is still considered the United States' deadliest natural disaster.⁷ Hurricane Ike (2008) decimated large portions of the Bolivar Peninsula literally removing significant portions of the land mass.⁸ While only 17 people were killed in Texas, property damage exceeded \$50 billion.⁹ In 2017, Hurricane Harvey struck the region, bringing catastrophic rainfall-triggered flooding that inflicted over \$125 billion in damages.¹⁰




Figure 8.2. Tide gauge measurements Galveston Pier, TX, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8771450 (downloaded 4/22/2025).

New Orleans and the Mississippi delta

⁶ Kasmarek, M.C., and Ramage, J.K., 2017, Water-level altitudes 2017 and water-level changes in the Chicot, Evangeline, and Jasper aquifers and compaction 1973–2016 in the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers, Houston-Galveston region, Texas: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2017–5080, 32 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20175080>.

⁷ Weems, John Edward, "Galveston Hurricane of 1900", Texas State Historical Association, (March 15, 2016) <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/galveston-hurricane-of-1900>.

⁸ "Galveston County, Texas, Faces Sea Level Rise and Storms", Union of Concerned Scientists, (June 23, 2017) <https://www.ucs.org/resources/galveston-county-texas-faces-sea-level-rise-and-storms>.

⁹ White, Audrey, "Galveston Still Healing 5 Years After Hurricane Ike", The Texas Tribune, (April 26, 2013) <https://www.texastribune.org/2013/04/26/galveston-still-healing-5-years-after-hurricane-ike/>.

¹⁰ NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) U.S. Billion-Dollar Weather and Climate Disasters (2025). <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/>, DOI: 10.25921/stkw-7w73

There are long-term tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, Louisiana, respectively estimating that sea level has risen slightly more than 3 feet over the last 100 years and at an average rate of 0.36 inches/year (Figure 8.3). Vertical land motion (subsidence) is estimated -0.28 inches/year at Grand Isle. From Table 6.1, the absolute sea level rise is +0.08 inches/year at Grand Isle.




Figure 8.3. Tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, LA, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8761724 (downloaded 4/22/25).

The issues of sea level rise and land loss in the Mississippi delta region are complex, with geological subsidence and the decline in sediment transported by the Mississippi river being the dominant drivers. Due to the construction of dams in the basin since the 1950s, the suspended sediment load of the Mississippi River has decreased by ~50%.¹¹ A new subsidence map of coastal Louisiana finds the coastal region to be sinking at about one third of an inch per year.¹² For a city whose elevation averages one to two feet below sea level, sea level rise from human caused warming is not the dominant driver for the problems that New Orleans is facing.

New York City

New York City is particularly vulnerable to the effects of sea level rise because it is built primarily on islands and has 520 miles of coastline. In New York City, relative sea level has risen over 11 inches over the past century, at an average rate of 0.11 inches/year (Figure 8.4). Vertical land motion in the New York City area is occurring at a rate of -0.05 inches/year (subsidence), corresponding to roughly 5 inches per century. From Table 6.1, the absolute rate of sea level rise at The Battery location is 0.06 inches/year, or about 55% of the measured relative sea level rise.

¹¹ Jillian M. Maloney et al., "Mississippi River Subaqueous Delta Is Entering a Stage of Retrogradation," *Marine Geology* 400 (June 2018): 12–23, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2018.03.001>.

¹² Jaap H. Nienhuis et al., "A New Subsidence Map for Coastal Louisiana," *GSA Today* 27, no. 6 (June 2017): 28–29, <https://doi.org/10.1130/GSATG337GW.1>.




Figure 8.4. Tide gauge measurements at The Battery, New York, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8518750 (downloaded 4/22/25).

Following Hurricane Sandy, New York has developed a comprehensive plan: *City of New York: Building a Stronger, More Resilient New York*.¹³ A broad range of coastal protection measures are outlined that match the risks facing a given area: increase coastal edge elevations, minimize upland wave zones, infrastructure to protect against storm surge, improve coastal design and governance, restore estuaries wetlands, coastal nourishment, site elevation, and drainage systems.

9.2. Sea level rise projections

The concern over sea level rise is not about the 8 inches or so that global mean sea level has risen since 1900. Rather, the concern is about projections of 21st century sea level rise based on climate model-based projections of human-caused global warming.

The IPCC AR6 finds that there is high agreement across published global mean sea level projections for 2050 and there is little sensitivity to emissions scenarios. Considering only projections incorporating ice-sheet processes in whose quantification there is at least medium confidence, the global sea level projections for 2050, across all emissions scenarios, fall between 3.94 and 15.75 inches (5th–95th percentile very likely range) relative to the 1995–2014 baseline period.

Conversely, there is low agreement across published global mean sea level projections for 2100, particularly for higher emissions scenarios. Considering only projections representing processes in whose quantification there is at least medium confidence, the AR6 global mean sea level projections for 2100 lie between 7.87 and 39.37 inches (5th–95th percentile very likely range) under the medium emissions scenario SSP2–4.5. There is deep uncertainty surrounding projections of sea level rise to 2100, particularly for the higher emissions scenarios.

¹³ City of New York, *A Stronger, More Resilient New York* (New York: City of New York, June 2013), http://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/sirr/SIRR_singles_Hi_res.pdf.

In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995-2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025. From the tide gauge measurements in Figures 8.1-8.4, there is no obvious acceleration in sea level rise beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

9.3. Summary

Since 1900, global sea level has risen by about 8". Sea level change along U.S. coasts is highly variable, associated with local variations in processes that contribute to sinking and also ocean circulation patterns. The highest levels of sea level rise along U.S. coasts are Galveston, New Orleans, and the Chesapeake Bay regions — each of these locations is associated with substantial local sinking that is unrelated to climate change.

Extreme projections of global sea level rise are associated with the implausible extreme emissions scenario and inclusion of poorly understood processes associated with hypothesized ice sheet instabilities. In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995-2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025 and at a lower rate than predicted. From the tide gauge measurements in Figures 8.1-8.4, there is no obvious acceleration in sea level rise beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

Part III: Impacts on Ecosystems and Society

10. Climate change and US agriculture

10.1. Econometric analyses

Econometric analyses of the effects of climate change on agriculture have sought to integrate information about long term crop yield changes in response to temperature and precipitation changes under assumptions about adaptive behavior by farmers. One method focuses on variations in agricultural land values. The rationale is that if climate change is a long-term net benefit for agriculture it should translate into higher market values for agricultural land, and vice versa. While individual crops might benefit from or be harmed by climate change, once the adaptive responses of farmers are taken into account the value of farmland represents an index of whether the changes are expected to be beneficial or not. Mendelsohn et al. (1994) examined the relationship between historical climatic variations on agricultural land values and concluded global warming would be slightly beneficial to American agriculture.

The Mendelsohn et al. method, called Ricardian analysis after David Ricardo, the 19th century British economist who pioneered the study of land values, attracted subsequent criticism from authors who argued it failed to account for differences in land values attributable to fixed locational characteristics like soil quality, and non-climatic changes including nearby urbanization. Deschênes and Greenstone (2007) looked at agricultural profits instead of land values and reached similar conclusions to Mendelsohn et al. (1994), namely that past climatic variations had relatively little effect on farm profitability and that warming would likely yield small overall benefits for the US agricultural sector. However a subsequent exchange with critics led them (Deschênes and Greenstone 2012) to revise their conclusions and project potentially large losses in US agriculture due to climate warming. Burke and Emerick (2016) looked at temperature variations over 1980 to 2000 and argued that farmers were not as able to adapt to temperature changes as the Ricardian method assumes and that climate change would have large negative impacts on corn and soy yields. Schlenker and Roberts (2009) similarly argued that yield gains to past warming would not carry over to the future and corn and soy yields would sharply decrease this century due to climate change.

Two recent studies have argued that pessimistic findings such as these are not robust. Ortiz-Bobea (2019) argued that land values aggregate farm and non-farm influences and the latter need to be filtered out. He developed a data set using cash rents for agricultural activity as a measure of land value specifically for farming activity. Whereas the land value model implied future losses under climate warming, the same model estimated using cash rents did not, leading the author to conclude the pessimistic results were due to using an inaccurate measure of the returns to farming activity. Bareille and Chakir (2023) assembled a large data base on farm sale prices in France for properties that sold twice between 1996 and 2019. They could replicate pessimistic results showing negative effects of warming on agricultural land values using conventional econometric modeling. But by taking advantage of the repeat sales data, which provides information on site-specific changes in land prices, they found the results reversed and implied that climate change will be very beneficial for French agriculture. The authors concluded that, taking adaptation into account, a warming climate would yield positive benefits for French agriculture that were between two and 20 times larger than had previously been estimated.

On average, with full adaptation, they concluded that climate changes under the medium RCP4.5 scenario could double the value of French farmland by 2100.

A major deficiency of all these studies, however, is that they omit the role of CO₂ fertilization. Climate change as it relates to this report is caused by GHG emissions, chiefly CO₂. The econometric analyses referenced above focus only on temperature and precipitation changes and do not take account of the beneficial growth effect of the additional CO₂ that drives them. As explained in Chapter 2 CO₂ is a major driver of plant growth so this omission biases the analysis towards underestimation of the benefits of climate change on agriculture.

10.2. Field studies of CO₂ enrichment

One of the ways the effect of CO₂ on crop growth has been studied is through “free air enrichment experiment” or FACE plots, in which small chimneys are placed in fields surrounding plants and the growth response to elevated CO₂ under varying weather conditions are recorded. Ainsworth et al. (2020) summarizes results from about 250 such studies. They found that elevation of CO₂ by 200 ppm cause an average 18% increase in crop yield in C3 plants. C4 plants exhibited benefits mainly under drought conditions.

In addition to FACE plot experiments there have been thousands of laboratory experiments on the effects of CO₂ on all kinds of plant growth. Here we review some of the results on key US agricultural crops.

Soybean

Studies on the impact of elevated CO₂ on Soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) plants in the water-deficient region of Huang-Huai-Hai Plain, China, showed that elevated CO₂ concentrations resulted in improved photosynthesis rate, water use efficiency and growth (Li, 2013) under both normal conditions and drought conditions. The CO2Science.org website reports on 108 published experiments between 1985 and 2019 exposing soybean to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +50.9 percent. In addition there were 10 studies reporting on +600 ppm CO₂ enrichment, resulting in an average increase in photosynthesis of 90.3%.

Maize (corn)

The CO2Science.org website reports on 28 published experiments between 1983 and 2018 exposing corn (*Zea mays* L.) to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +23.7 percent. Corn also benefits from increased drought tolerance under elevated CO₂. An experimental study (Allen Jr, 2011) exposed plants to water stress conditions in sunlit controlled-environment chambers at 360 ppm (ambient) and 720 ppm (elevated) CO₂. The drought stress caused a 41% loss of growth under ambient CO₂ but only a 13% loss under elevated CO₂.

Wheat

The CO2Science.org website reports on 92 published experiments between 1983 and 2020 exposing common wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) to enriched CO₂ levels. Converted to a +300ppm common scale the average growth benefit was +67.6 percent. Blandino (2020) measured the yield as well as nutritional quality of an “improver” hybrid wheat variety and its parents under elevated CO₂ levels (+166 ppm). They reported a grain yield increase of +16% but a 7% decrease in grain protein levels. But they found that the food quality of different wheat varieties responded differently to elevated CO₂ levels, so that with proper varietal selection end-users can select wheat types that best take advantage of the elevated CO₂.

Further evidence

A 2021 report from the US National Bureau of Economic Research (Taylor and Schlenker 2021) used satellite-measured observations of outdoor CO₂ levels across the United States, matched to county-level agricultural output data and other economic variables. After controlling for the effects of weather, pollution and technology the authors concluded that CO₂ emissions had boosted US crop production since 1940 by 50 to 80 percent, attributing much larger gains than had previously been estimated using FACE experiments. They found that every ppm of increase in CO₂ concentration boosts corn yields by 0.5 percent, soybeans by 0.6 percent, and wheat by 0.8 percent.




Figure 10.1: US average CO₂ levels and yields of corn, soy and wheat all normalized so 1940=100. Source: Taylor and Schlenker (2021)

Beyond growth benefits, extra CO₂ boosts plant resilience to heat. Deryng et al. (2016) surveyed all available evidence regarding how wheat, maize, rice and soybean will grow under a combination of climate warming and rising CO₂ levels. They concluded that warming would, eventually, have a negative effect on plant growth but it would be fully compensated by the extra CO₂ for wheat and soybean, and almost fully for rice and maize. And as discussed in Chapter 2, plants use water more efficiently when there is more CO₂ in the air.

Deryng et al. (2016) surveyed evidence on crop water productivity (CWP), i.e. yield per unit of water used, drawing attention to the potential for CO₂ both to enhance photosynthesis and reduce leaf-level transpiration (water loss during leaf respiration). They surveyed all available FACE data on crop yield changes for Maize (corn), Wheat, Rice and Soybean, and combined it with crop model data simulating yield responses as of 2080 under the extreme RCP8.5 scenario in four growing regions (Tropics, Arid, Temperate and Cold) each of which were split into rainfed and irrigated sub-regions. In every region they reported that models without CO₂ fertilization predicted CWP losses but CO₂ fertilization more than offset them and once it was taken into account all regions showed a net CWP gain. Deryng et al (2016) also reported that negative impacts on wheat and soybean yields were fully offset by CWP gains, and mitigated by up to 90% for rice and 60% for maize.

Similar to this, Cheng et al. (2017) noted that increased global plant growth from 1982 to 2011 due to rising CO₂ uptake was accompanied by such large gains in CWP that despite the extra biomass global water use by plants had not increased.

Deryng et al. (2016) assumed that climate change would “exacerbate water scarcity”. It is noteworthy that while models predict drylands will expand under climate warming, current data show the opposite: greening is happening even in arid areas. Zhang et al. (2014) report that due to increased CO₂ levels “increasing aridity in drylands won’t lead to a general loss of vegetation productivity”; increased desertification will happen in at most 4% of currently arid areas.

10.3. Crop modeling meta-analyses

Notwithstanding the abundant evidence for the direct benefits of CO₂ and of CO₂-induced warming on crop growth, in 2023 the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 2023) boosted its estimate of the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) about five-fold based in large part on a very pessimistic 2017 estimate of global agricultural damages from climate warming (Moore et al., 2017). One of the two damage models used by the EPA attributed nearly half of the 2030 SCC to projected global agricultural damages based on the Moore et al. (2017) analysis. This study was a meta-analysis of crop model studies simulating yield changes for agricultural crops under various climate warming scenarios. Moore et al. projected declining global crop yields for all crop types in all regions due to warming.

McKittrick (2025) re-examined the Moore et al. database and found that, while it claimed to cover 1,722 studies, only half the entries ($N=862$) had complete records, so that the sample available for regression analysis was much smaller than both studies indicated. McKittrick noted that the variable most commonly missing was the change in ambient CO_2 and found that in many cases these could be recovered from the underlying studies or the original climate scenario tables. He thereby increased the usable sample size by 40 percent. The crop yield projections incorporating the newly available data changed considerably. As shown in Figure 10.2, whereas the partial data set implied warming would decrease yield (blue lines), the complete data set implied constant or increase global yields, even out to 5°C warming (green lines).




Figure 10.2 Crop yields under CO_2 -induced climate warming. Blue: as published in Moore et al. (2017). Green: after including omitted data. Source: McKittrick (2025).

In summary, there is abundant evidence going back decades that rising CO₂ levels benefit plants including agricultural crops, and that CO₂-induced warming will be a net benefit to US agriculture. The warming since 1981, in combination with adaptive behaviour by farmers, has been beneficial on its own for maize. The increased ambient CO₂ has also boosted productivity of all major US crop types. Various attempts to argue that CO₂-induced warming will harm agriculture do not hold up under scrutiny.

Deschênes, Olivier and Michael Greenstone (2007) The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Output and Random Fluctuations in Weather *American Economic Review*. Feb 2007, Vol. 97, No. 1: Pages 354-385

Deschênes, Olivier and Michael Greenstone (2012) The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Output and Random Fluctuations in Weather: Reply to Comment *American Economic Review*. 102, no. 7: 3761-3773. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/82641>

Ortiz-Bobea, Ariel (2019) The role of nonfarm influences in ricardian estimates of climate change impacts on US agriculture. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 102 (3), 934–959.

Schlenker, Wolfram and Michael Roberts (2009) Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe damages to U.S. crop yields under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (37) 15594-15598 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0906865106>

11. Managing risks of extreme weather

11.1. Socioeconomic context

Risks from human-caused climate change are convoluted with natural weather and climate variability, and are dominated by the exposure of wealth in coastal and other disaster-prone regions and vulnerabilities of poorer populations. The evolution of climate risk in the U.S. has been dominated by societal factors, rather than by changes to the actual weather and climate hazards. Deaths from weather disasters have decreased substantially since 1900, even as US population grew from 76 million in 1900 to over 331 million in 2020. For example, the Galveston hurricane killed over 8,000 people in 1900 (0.01% of the US population), whereas the worst recent disaster, Hurricane Katrina in 2005, killed 1800 people (or 0.0006% of the US population).

Technological advances have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Early warning systems, satellite monitoring, and improved weather forecasting have reduced deaths, although exact numbers are hard to quantify. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31361>

US weather forecasting has been estimated to reduce losses from weather events with an annualized benefit of \$31.5B, protecting lives, property, and supporting agriculture and transportation <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/12888/chapter/2> Improved hurricane forecasts have reduced pre- and post-landfall spending, with annual per hurricane cost reductions estimated at \$5B

<https://www.nber.org/digest/202409/value-improving-hurricane-forecasts>

Infrastructure improvements have contributed to substantial reductions in losses from extreme weather events. Building codes, such as those implemented in Florida after Hurricane Andrew (1992) have reduced losses by ensuring structures can withstand high winds and floods. Homes built after 2002 showed minimal damage during Hurricane Michael (2018), unlike older homes.

<https://www.fema.gov/case-study/role-floridas-building-codes-2018-hurricane-michael>. Sea walls, like the Galveston Seawall, protect against wave action and storm surge. The New Orleans Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System successfully mitigated storm surge during Hurricane Isaac (2012). Inland dams in the US help control flooding by storing excess water during heavy rains. It is estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) dams prevent about \$309M in annual flood damage in the TVA region and along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers <https://www.tva.com/environment/managing-the-river/flood-management>

During Hurricane Helene (2024), TVA's strategies prevented approximately \$406M in potential damages. <https://www.publicpower.org/periodical/article/tva-flood-mitigation-strategies-prevented-approximately-406-million-potential-damages>

11.2. Data challenges

Since 1980, NOAA has provided a count of annual U.S. weather-related disasters that it estimates to have exceeded \$1Billion (inflation adjusted), showing a substantial increase starting in 2008. NOAA and other government officials have cited the upward trend in the BDD series as evidence that climate change is making extreme weather worse (Pielke Jr. 2024). But over time, population and wealth have increased dramatically in the US, so when an extreme weather or climate event occurs, there is more damage even if there is no underlying trend in the frequency or intensity of extreme weather. A recent estimate finds that losses per weather disaster are down by about 80% since 1980, as a proportion of GDP.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MvgwcWaimcn1oHODqNZDG1fXF4M5Idnn/view>

Pielke Jr. (2024) argued that in addition to relying on opaque data sources and unreported adjustments NOAA failed to normalize its Billion Dollar Disaster (BDD) data series properly for changes in population exposure and wealth. In May 2025 NOAA announced it has withdrawn the billion dollar disaster product from publication (Pielke Jr. 2025).

In summary, trends in losses from extreme weather and climate events are dominated by population increases and economic growth. Technological advances such as improved weather forecasting and early warning systems have substantially reduced losses from extreme weather events. Better building codes, flood defenses, and disaster response mechanisms have lowered economic losses relative to GDP. And finally, the US economy's expansion has diluted the relative impact of disaster costs, as seen in the comparison of historical and modern GDP percentages.

Pielke Jr., Roger (2024) Scientific integrity and U.S. "Billion Dollar Disasters" *NPJ Natural Hazards* 1
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s44304-024-00011-0>

Pielke Jr., Roger (2025) "RIP NOAA's Billion Dollar Disasters" Substack essay May 8, 2025
<https://rogerpielkejr.substack.com/p/rip-noaas-billion-dollar-disasters>

12. Mortality from temperature extremes

12.1. Heat and cold risks

Changes in temperature extremes are among the most certain impacts expected in a warming globe -- extreme heat events are expected to become more frequent while extreme cold events become less frequent. This pattern is evident in the historical period (as discussed in Section XX) and is expected to intensify with continued warming.

Mortality during heat extremes is typically caused by heat stroke and heat exhaustion, while mortality during cold extremes is typically caused by hypothermia and heart strain. It is well known that global mortality is substantially greater for extreme cold than for extreme heat.^{14,15}

Specific to the U.S., extreme heat and extreme cold both kill hundreds of people each year.; however, different approaches to assessing heat/cold mortality produces different results. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics Compressed Mortality Database, which is based on death certificates, indicates that about twice as many people die of “excessive cold” conditions in a given year than of “excessive heat.”^{16,17}

A 2015 epidemiological study of deaths in published in *The Lancet* found that cold-related deaths in the U.S. were about a factor of fifteen higher than heat-related deaths.¹⁸ However, the study did not adjust for the seasonal cycle in mortality rates, which tend to increase during the winter months due to non-weather factors like influenza.¹⁹ A more recent paper found that 86% of temperature-related deaths in the U.S. are due to cold-related mortality.²⁰

¹⁴ Qi Zhao et al., “Global, Regional, and National Burden of Mortality Associated with Non-Optimal Ambient Temperatures from 2000 to 2019: A Three-Stage Modelling Study,” *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5, no. 7 (July 2021), [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(21\)00081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00081-4).

¹⁵ <https://ourworldindata.org/part-one-how-many-people-die-from-extreme-temperatures-and-how-could-this-change-in-the-future>

¹⁶ Brett R. Scheffers et al., “The Broad Footprint of Climate Change from Genes to Biomes to People,” *Science* 354, no. 6313 (November 11, 2016): aaf7671, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf7671>.

¹⁷ Rachel H. Alinsky, Scott E. Hadland, J. Deanna Wilson, Pamela A. Matson, and Brendan Saloner, “Trends in Polysubstance Overdose Deaths Involving Opioids, Stimulants, and Benzodiazepines by Race and Ethnicity in the US, 2007-2021,” *JAMA Network Open* 7, no. 3 (March 2024): e238249, <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.8249>.

¹⁸ Lancet Commission on Climate and Health, “Health and Climate Change: Policy Responses to Protect Public Health,” *The Lancet* 386, no. 10006 (November 7, 2015): 1861–1914, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)60854-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60854-6).

¹⁹ Bob Henson, “Which Kills More People: Extreme Heat or Extreme Cold?” *Weather Underground*, January 22, 2019, <https://www.wunderground.com/cat6/Which-Kills-More-People-Extreme-Heat-or-Extreme-Cold>.

²⁰ Tarik Benmarhnia et al., “Deaths Attributable to Heat and Cold: Comparison of Data Sources and Evaluation of Inconsistencies,” *GeoHealth* 8, no. 3 (March 2024): e2023GH000799, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GH000799>.




Figure 12.1: Time series of temperature-related deaths across all 106 cities. (a) The solid line represents total temperature-related deaths, while the dashed line indicates temperature-related deaths with a fixed population (average population from the 1987–2000 period). (b) Similar to (a), but for heat-related deaths. (c) Similar to (a), but for cold-related deaths. (d) Time series of deaths occurring in temperatures above the 97.5th percentile. (e) Similar to (d), but for temperatures below the 2.5th percentile. From <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2023GH000799>

The IPCC AR6 Working Group 2 Chapter 16.2.3.5 states how heat-related mortality is declining over time:²¹

“Heat-attributable mortality fractions have declined over time in most countries owing to general improvements in health care systems, increasing prevalence of residential air conditioning, and behavioral changes. These factors, which determine the susceptibility of the population to heat, have predominated over the influence of temperature change.”

A 2011 study of 40 major US cities between 1975 and 2004, found that heat wave mortality had decreased, in spite of rising temperatures, due to adaptation.²² Likewise Davis et al. (2003) examined heat-related mortality in 28 U.S. cities from the 1960s to the end of the 1990s and found that heat-related mortality declined by three-quarters over the sample period. Bobb et al. (2014) examined mortality data for 106 million people in over 100 cities U.S. cities and found a 60% decline in average heat-related mortality over the period 1987–2005, from 51 per thousand deaths to 19. They furthermore found that the greatest drop was among seniors over the age of 75. In a study of 42 million

²¹ B. O'Neill et al., “Key Risks Across Sectors and Regions,” in *Climate Change 2022: Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Geneva, CH: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021), 2411–2538.

²² Keith T. Ingram, Carolyn W. Furman, and John W. Jones, “Climate Change Impact and Adaptation Assessment: A Guide for Coastal Resources Managers,” *Weather, Climate, and Society* 3, no. 4 (October 2011): 234–249, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-11-00055.1>.

deaths in 211 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006. Nordio et al. (2015) found a more than 90 percent decline in the risk of mortality from excess heat.

In the context of large declines in heat-related mortality, by reducing mortality from cold events rising temperatures are associated with a net saving of lives.

It is both disappointing and telling to see how the IPCC misrepresents the situation in its AR6 Synthesis report. Section A.2.5 of that document states: “In all regions increases in extreme heat events have resulted in human mortality and morbidity (*very high confidence*).” But it is silent on the larger decline of deaths during extreme cold events.

12.2. The importance of adaptation

The observed decline in US heat-related mortality has been specifically attributed to adaptation. Wang et al. (2018) exploited the spatial variability of heatwave-related mortality across 209 U.S. cities from 1962 to 2006. While simple correlation appeared to imply an increase in mortality risk during heatwaves, accounting for adaptation to heatwave intensity caused the effect to fall to near zero and become statistically insignificant. They used the results of their epidemiological model to project heat-related mortality out to 2050 under four RCP warming scenarios (including RCP8.5) with and without adaptive behavior. Assuming people continue to adapt to the heatwave risks in the regions in which they live Wang et al. project not only no increase in heat-related mortality but an overall decrease for the US as a whole. They conclude that “Ignoring adaptation would result in a substantial overestimate of future mortality related to heat waves... Accounting for adaptation, the overall heat-related mortality by 2050 would not change substantially over time compared to 2006.”

12.3. Mortality risks and energy costs

A 2016 study of US long term mortality risks associated with temperature variations (Barreca et al. 2016) showed that increases in mortality across the US are associated both with cold weather and hot weather. But over time, the introduction of electricity and the adoption of central heating and air conditioning (AC) dramatically reduced both risks, especially those associated with hot weather. Prior to 1960, a day above 90°F (32°C) added 2.2 percent to the average mortality risk rate, but after 1960 the same weather added only 0.3 percent to mortality risk, an 85 percent reduction. Prior to 1960 temperatures below 39°F (4°C) added about 1 percent to mortality risk but after 1960 the same weather only added about half that amount. Adaptation through conventional household improvements dramatically reduced public vulnerability to weather extremes. The entire reduction in hot weather mortality was attributable to widespread adoption of indoor AC, which depended on the availability of reliable and affordable electricity.

The corollary of this finding is that the use of heating and cooling systems depends on energy being affordable. Doremus et al. (2022) showed that wealthy and poor households in the US adjust their energy expenditures at similar rates in response to moderate temperature swings, but not in response to extreme temperature swings. When temperatures swing to very cold levels (< 5°C) energy spending in high-income households rises by 1.2 percent but in low-income households by only 0.5 percent. On very

hot days (>30°C) electricity spending in high-income households rises by 0.5 percent but does not change at all in low-income households. The latter result is observed even in subsamples where all households have AC. The implication is that even with widespread adoption of home heating and cooling systems, inability to afford energy leaves low-income households exposed to weather extremes.

Barreca, Alan, Karen Clay, Olivier Deschenes, Michael Greenstone, and Joseph S Shapiro, “Adapting to climate change: The remarkable decline in the US temperature mortality relationship over the twentieth century,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2016, 124 (1), 105–159.

J.M. Doremus, I. Jacqz and S. Johnston (2022), “Sweating the energy bill: Extreme weather, poor households, and the energy spending gap.” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2022.102609> .

Nordio, Francesco, Antonella Zanobetti, Elena Colicino, Itai Kloog and Joel Schwartz (2015). “Changing patterns of the temperature–mortality association by time and location in the US, and implications for climate change” *Environment International*, Volume 81, pp 80-86
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.04.009>.

Wang, Yan, Francesco Nordio , John Nairn , Antonella Zanobetti and Joel D. Schwartz (2018) “Accounting for adaptation and intensity in projecting heat wave-related mortality” *Environmental Research* 161 pp. 464—471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2017.11.049>

Bobb JF, Peng RD, Bell ML, Dominici F. (2014) Heat-related mortality and adaptation to heat in the United States. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 122:811–816;
<https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/full/10.1289/ehp.1307392>

Davis, Robert E., Paul C. Knappenberger, Patrick J. Michaels and Wendy M. Novicoff (2003) “Changing Heat-Related Mortality in the United States” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 111(14) November 2003 pp. 1712—1718.

13. Climate change, the economy and the Social Cost of Carbon

13.1. Climate change and economic growth

13.1.1 Overview: climate is a relatively minor issue for a modern economy

It has long been noted that economies tend to do poorly in very cold and very hot regions, with the optimum somewhere in between (Nordhaus 2006). Temperature-sensitive economic activity migrates, whenever possible, to where it is best suited, and society always adapts to the local climate. Based in part on these observations, in 1992 Thomas Schelling, then President of the American Economic Association, argued that any effects climate change on US economic activity would be small relative to the many other changes that would happen.

... Manufacturing rarely depends on climate, and where temperature and humidity used to make a difference, air conditioning has intervened. When Toyota chooses among Ohio, Alabama, and Southern California for locating an automobile assembly, geographical considerations are important, but not because of climate... Finance is little affected by climate; similarly for health care, or education, or broadcasting. Transportation can be affected, but improvements in all-weather landing and take-off in the last 30 years are greater than any differences that climate makes. If the average effect is a warming, iced waterways and snow removal may decline in importance. Construction is affected, mainly by cold, and if the average effect is in the direction of warming, construction may benefit slightly.

It is really agriculture that is affected. But even if agricultural productivity declined by a third over the next half century, the per capita GNP we might have achieved by 2050 we would achieve only in 2051. ...

I conclude that in the United States, and probably Japan, Western Europe, and other developed countries, the impact on economic output will be negligible and unlikely to be noticed.

(Schelling 1992, emphasis added)

Thirty years later virtually the identical point was made by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report:

For most economic sectors, the impact of climate change will be small relative to the impacts of other drivers. Changes in population, age, income, technology, relative prices, lifestyle, regulation, governance, and many other aspects of socioeconomic development will have an impact on the supply and demand of economic goods and services that is large relative to the impact of climate change.

(Arent et al. 2014, emphasis added)

That statement is validated by experience. Since 1900, the average global surface temperature anomaly warmed 1.3°C, about as much as the IPCC predicts will occur in the next century under a moderate emissions scenario. But even as the globe warmed and the population quintupled, humanity prospered as never before. For example, global average lifespan went from thirty-two years to seventy-two years, economic activity per capita grew by a factor of seven, and the death rate from extreme weather events plummeted by a factor of fifty!

While extreme weather events are costly, in all modern economies they are becoming steadily less and less important (Formetta and Feyen 2019). Since 1990 weather-related disaster losses have declined as a proportion of global GDP (Pielke Jr 2018, 2020) as have mortality risks (Formetta and Feyen 2019). While economic weather-related insurance payouts are rising, this is fully explained by the growth in the size of the economy and the value of the insured asset stock. Past increases in episodes extreme weather have not had a significant effect (positive or negative) on the market value of insurance firms (Hu and McKittrick 2015). Nor have past extreme weather events had a significant effect on US banks' performance (Blickle et al. 2021).

For these reasons, economists have long been reluctant to endorse attempts to “stop” climate change or even aggressively reduce GHG emissions because the costs would not be worth it. As one critic of the economics of climate policy put it:

Mainstream climate economics takes global warming seriously, but perplexingly concludes that the optimal economic policy is to almost do nothing about it... The contrast is striking. While climate science is sending out loud-and-clear messages that fossil-fuel disinvestment must start now, letting go of coal and oil and diverting resources into renewable energy technology systems, to keep warming below the 2°C limit (IPCC 2014), mainstream climate economics claims that overly ambitious climate targets will unnecessarily hurt the economy and immediate de-carbonization is too expensive. Most climate economists thus recommend humanity to just wait-and-see.

(Storm 2017)

The mainstream economics position on the climate policy question is best represented by the findings over the past three decades from Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) of climate change policy, for which Yale economist William Nordhaus was awarded the 2018 Nobel Memorial Prize in economics. IAMs combine economic, climate, and social data into a unified framework for simulating climate damages and evaluating the optimal policy response (Resources for the Future 2025). Nordhaus' work has generally supported modest global climate policy, with aggressive measures largely deferred to later in the century. Nordhaus developed the so-called Dynamic Integrated Model of the Climate and Economy model, or DICE, in the early 1990s (Nordhaus 1993) to study the interaction between climate change, climate policy, and global economic growth over long times. DICE assumes global emission control can be coordinated at no cost and asks what the optimal policy target should be. The climate component of the DICE model is based on simplified climatological modeling. The version of DICE at the

time of Nordhaus' Nobel Prize award was described in Nordhaus (2018); it had a climate sensitivity parameter of 3.1°C for CO₂ doubling, consistent with the best estimate in contemporary IPCC reports (3.0°C).

The baseline (no policy) scenario incurs only \$0.4T in global abatement costs and leads to \$134.2T (trillion dollars) in global climate damages for a total cost of \$134.6T. The climate model component of DICE projects 4.1°C warming by 2100 relative to preindustrial temperatures. Note that this is a higher estimate of warming than many IPCC climate models. (AR6 offers 2.7°C in 2100 under a moderate emissions scenario.)

The Optimal Policy scenario barely deviates from the business-as-usual path. It aims for +3.5°C warming, in other words we scale back only the lowest-value fossil fuel use and otherwise just live with almost all the warming. This suggests that most CO₂ emissions are less harmful than the policies that would be necessary to abate them. Trying to prevent warming causes costs quickly to outstrip the benefits. Pursuing a goal of capping warming at 2.5°C creates total costs of \$177.8T, which is \$43.2T worse than doing nothing at all. Nordhaus didn't evaluate trying to reach a Paris-type target of 1.5°C warming but it would be even worse.

A subsequent edition of DICE includes higher assumed damages from warming which, not surprisingly leads to more aggressive policy recommendations, as explained in the section below on the Social Cost of Carbon.

13.1.2 Empirical analysis of climate change and economic growth

Many other studies have used econometric methods instead of IAMs to look at the potential impact of climate change on economic growth. Dell et al. (2012, herein DJO12) was an influential study that used a multi-country panel of national-level data spanning 1950 to 2005, in which they matched climate and economic data by averaging temperature from the local grid cell level up to the national level using population weights. They found that warming yields an insignificant positive effect on income growth in rich countries but a significant negative effect in poor countries. Moore and Diaz (2015) modified the DICE model to take that finding into account and concluded that it implied a dramatically higher Social Cost of Carbon due to the compounding effects of income loss over time.

A large subsequent literature has debated the robustness of the DJO12 findings. Burke et al. (2015) analyzed a global panel with temperatures averaged up to the national level and found a negative effect on growth from warming in rich and poor countries alike when the national average temperature is above 13°C. Zhao et al. (2018) used the G-Econ data set of Nordhaus (2006), which breaks economic activity down to the grid cell level, replicated DJO12-type results on the same subset of countries as used in DJO12 but then showed that on the full global sample warming increases growth in rich countries and poor countries alike, though the positive effect in the latter group is confined to where local temperatures are below about 16°C. Greßer et al. (2021) developed a regional economic data set for 1,542 sub-national regions around the world between 2005 and 2015 and found temperature had no effect on growth. Yang et al. (2023) updated the DJO12 data set and applied an estimator robust to

mixed sample frequencies, finding that while temperature shocks exerted a temporary effect on income levels, they did not have a significant lasting effect on growth rates.

Newell et al. (2021) noted that there is no underlying theory to guide econometric model specification in this literature. Taking into account the arbitrary choices of which explanatory variables to include they identified over 800 possible model specifications. Using the Burke et al. (2015) data they used an estimation method that accounts for model uncertainty and found that the model form preferred by Burke et al. (2015), which implied negative effects of warming on growth even in rich countries, is explicitly excluded by the optimal model selection algorithm. Overall they could not detect a temperature effect on GDP or GDP growth, and they estimated the 95% confidence interval for the impact on global growth as of 2100 even under the exaggerated RCP8.5 warming scenario spans -86 percent to +388 percent. In other words the net effect is likely positive but too uncertain to distinguish from zero.


Barker (2023) criticized the DJO12 assumption that countries can be grouped into fixed “poor” and “rich” categories based on their incomes many decades ago. He noted that many countries were once poor but became rich over time, and if this is considered the original temperature effects reported by Dell et al. became small and insignificant.

Berg et al. (2023) argued that countries shouldn’t be grouped into large Rich/Poor categories because they are too heterogeneous. They instead estimated country-specific temperature response coefficients then grouped countries with similar response coefficients into small panels. They separately estimated responses to global and idiosyncratic local temperature shocks to better identify the climate signal in weather data. Overall they found countries experiencing negative effects of warming on growth outnumbered those experiencing positive effects, but only temporarily: eventually the effects reverse such that about twice as many countries experience a net positive growth effect. They also found global (as opposed to local) temperature changes are much more likely to benefit growth in poor countries than rich ones. In a simulation to 2100 even using the extreme RCP8.5 scenario they computed the average global GDP loss would be only 1.9% compared to a scenario with no warming. That is, instead of the economy growing 400% it would grow 398%. The implication of Nordhaus’ analysis is that trying to prevent the warming would lead to far less than 398% growth.

To summarize, economists have long considered climate a relatively unimportant factor in economic growth, a view echoed by the IPCC itself in the Fifth Assessment Report. Mainstream climate economics has recognized that CO₂-induced warming may have some negative economic effects but they are too small to justify aggressive abatement policy, and trying to “stop” or cap global warming even at levels well above the Paris target would be worse than doing nothing. An influential study in 2012 suggested that global warming would harm growth in poor countries but it has subsequently been found not to be robust. Studies that take full account of modeling uncertainties either find no evidence of a negative effect on global growth from CO₂ emissions or find poor countries as likely to benefit from it as rich countries.

The expectation that significant global warming would have a small impact on the U.S. economy was acknowledged quietly by the Biden Administration, even as the President was proclaiming a climate emergency. The following figure, from a 2023 OMB-CEA [report](#), shows the expected decrement in U.S.

GDP as a function of temperature rise. The colored lines show the results of a dozen peer-reviewed published studies while the solid black line is their average. The figure could be summarized as “a few percent impact for a few degrees of warming”. Given that the economy’s annual growth rate is expected to be 1-2 percent, the impact of a warming globe is indeed negligible.



Need caption

13.2. Models of the Social Cost of Carbon

The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) is a tool for quantifying the economic impact of carbon dioxide emissions, helping policymakers weigh the costs and benefits of climate policies. It estimates the damage caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂, expressed in dollars. More formally, the SCC is the discounted present value of the current and future marginal loss of economic welfare due to an additional ton of CO₂ entering the atmosphere. On its own the SCC is not the appropriate price to attach to CO₂ emissions for the purpose of optimal emissions control but it can be converted into an optimal tax rate by scaling it by the Marginal Cost of Public Funds (MCPF). The theory behind this was first derived by Sandmo (1975) and has been reiterated many times since then by other economists working on the topic (e.g. Parry et al. 1999). The MCPF is the cost in terms of lost private economic welfare of raising public revenue by one dollar and always exceeds unity. If a jurisdiction does not use a carbon tax, this formula still indicates the upper bound on the amount emitters should spend on abatement options at the margin along the optimal policy path. Regulations should be imposed only insofar as they do not impose marginal abatement costs in excess of the optimal tax rate.

13.1.2 Estimating the SCC

Although the literature refers to “estimates” of the SCC, it is not estimated in the way other economic statistics are estimated. For instance, data on market transactions including prices and quantities can be used to estimate the current inflation rate or the growth rate of per capita real Gross Domestic Product, and there are well-understood uncertainties associated with these quantities. But there are no market data available to measure many if not most of the marginal damages or benefits believed to be associated with CO2 emissions, so these need to be imputed using economic models.

For example, an influential component of some SCC calculations is the perceived social cost associated with changed risk of future mortality due to extreme weather. There is no market in which people can directly attach a price to that risk. At best economists can try to infer such values by looking at transactions in related markets such as real estate or insurance, but isolating the component of price changes attributable to atmospheric CO2 levels is very difficult.

Economists use IAMs to compute the SCC. Two of the best known IAMs are the Climate Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation and Distribution (“FUND”, Tol 1997) and Nordaus’ DICE. IAMs embed a stylized global climate model with a very simplified representation of the global economy, including a “damage function” or set of functions relating ambient temperature to local economic conditions. The assumptions embedded in the damage function will largely determine the resulting SCC.

One approach to developing a damage function is to begin with estimates of the costs (or benefits) of warming in specific sectors in countries around the world and aggregate up to a global amount. This was the approach used in FUND. An alternative approach is to develop a simple equation that penalizes global income according to a simple quadratic function of the average global temperature. This approach was used in DICE. In the case of the FUND model many hundreds of parameters had to be selected, whereas in DICE only three were needed and were originally chosen to assign a predetermined penalty (1.2%) to global output as of 3°C warming, with a quadratic term implying that damages grow with the square of the global average temperature anomaly. Barrage and Nordhaus (2024) recently changed the parameters to increase the penalty at 3°C to 1.6%, and added a discrete additional 1.0% GDP penalty at 3°C warming to account for “tipping points” (discrete large-scale environmental changes triggered by crossing a warming threshold) and a “judgmental adjustment” of 0.5% for excluded impacts at 3°C warming. Not surprisingly the newer version of DICE generates much higher SCC estimates than before.

The concepts of estimation and uncertainty do not readily apply to SCC calculations. By comparison, the question of whether precipitation has trended up or down along the South Carolina coast for the past hundred years can be addressed by collecting rainfall data, estimating a trend parameter and calculating statistical confidence intervals using methods with well-understood mathematical properties. In this way uncertainty can, in principle, be resolved by collecting more data and applying more accurate methods. But no amount of data collection can change the fact that many components of the SCC are unknown and rely on judgment and opinion based on knowledge of the underlying literature on the physical effects of climate change.

SCC calculations are thus best thought of as “if-then” statements: *if* the following assumptions hold, *then* the SCC is \$X per tonne. The list of ‘if’ statements includes the premise that the world’s climate and economy work according to the representation in the IAM. One way this may fail to hold is in the timing of warming. Every IAM assumes a value of the Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity (ECS), controls the amount of warming that results from CO2 emissions and can be freely varied for the purpose of generating a distribution of SCC values associated with uncertainties over ECS. But as Roe and Baumann (2013)

pointed out, time-to-equilibrium increases with the square of ECS, so an upward adjustment of the ECS parameter without an appropriate slowing down of the adjustment process can yield distorted present value damage estimates. In particular, the upper tail of warming associated with some commonly-used ECS distributions is physically impossible for even a thousand years into the future (Roe and Baumann 2013) yet in an IAM would be realized within a couple of centuries. Failure to align ECS with time-to-equilibrium will lead to an overestimate of the SCC value.

13.2.2 Variations in the SCC

Every level of the IAM calculation includes assumptions, some more influential than others. Key assumptions include the following.

- The discount rate: Climate damages accrue over a long time horizon, and costs a century or two in the future need to be discounted to the present. The higher the discount rate the smaller the present value of future damages and vice versa. The discount rate represents the opportunity cost of spending money today rather than investing it and then having more to spend tomorrow. Some economists have argued for the use of very low discount rates in SCC calculations, resulting in policy recommendations that favor relatively large immediate investments in CO₂ emission reductions. The downside is that other investments could potentially earn a larger rate of return for society.
- Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity: IAMs have customarily employed a value of 3.0°C or 3.1°C following the IPCC's guidance. Empirically-estimated ECS values tend to be lower than this (see Chapter XX). Dayaratna et al. (2017, 2020, 2023) have shown that use of lower empirically-derived ECS values dramatically lower the resulting SCC estimate, even when low discount rates are used.
- Damage function coefficients: IAMs assume CO₂ and warming cause net harms that increase exponentially with temperature. More recently, IAMs have also incorporated effects from assumed potential climate tipping points. The FUND model took limited but explicit account of CO₂ fertilization effects in agriculture. Since the coefficients were selected prior the publication of the current evidence of global greening and the magnitude of benefits to crops from elevated CO₂ (see Chapters 2 and 10) the growth effects are likely understated. The DICE model (and others) did not explicitly include any CO₂ fertilization benefit, except to the extent it was taken into account in the literature consulted when picking the damage function coefficients. The damage function in FUND contains a region in which low warming yields net benefits in many regions, a finding which is supported by econometric models of warming and growth (Berg et al. 2023) and econometric simulations of agricultural changes (McKittrick 2025). The DICE damage function, by construction, rules out net benefits at any warming level.
- Emission scenarios: IAMs generate SCC estimates that increase as the pre-existing concentration of CO₂ increases. Consequently the value of damages later in the century will be higher, depending on the assumed baseline emissions over the coming decades.
- Abatement costs: IAMs represent the cost to the economy of reducing CO₂ emissions. If CO₂ emission reductions are assumed to be inexpensive, then the model will conclude that the optimal policy should aim for deeper emission cuts and vice versa.

It is informative to ascertain whether SCC results are invariant to changes in some assumptions. But when different assumptions result in higher or lower SCC values, the change in the SCC value does not provide *prima facie* evidence about the validity of the assumptions. For example, in 2023 the US Environmental Protection Agency raised its preferred SCC value about 5-fold over the estimates it had issued ten years earlier. This is not because new data had been collected or better mathematical methods had been invented, but because new assumptions had been used, and the validity of those assumptions was a separate question. One was that global agricultural damages were far higher than previously assumed, based on an analysis in Moore et al. (2017). But as discussed in Section XX, McKittrick (2025) showed that Moore et al. (2017) had used a database in which half the CO₂ change observations were missing. When as many of those observations as possible were recovered from underlying sources and the analysis was rerun, the projected crop yield losses disappeared and turned into gains at all warming levels. Hence the portion of the EPA's SCC revision attributable to agricultural yield losses was unwarranted.

13.2.3 Evidence for low SCC

Chapter 2 reviewed evidence on climate change and greening, and Chapter 10 looked at climate change and US agriculture. Evidence shows that CO₂ fertilization has a stronger beneficial effect on agriculture than was known at the time that IAMs like DICE and FUND were parameterized. In particular Haverd et al. (2020) found the observed CO₂ fertilization rate has been almost double what had been predicted by crop models. Dayaratna et al. (2023) used the updated empirical ECS distribution estimate of Lewis (2022), which assimilates modern instrumental and paleoclimatic temperature records, and allowed for a 30 percent gain in the CO₂ fertilization benefit in the FUND model, and found that, even at a low discount rate of 2.5 percent, the median SCC as of 2050 is only \$18.67, with a 24 percent probability of the true value being negative. At a five percent discount rate the median SCC value is negative until the mid-2040s and at 2050 was only \$0.37 with a 49 percent probability of being negative. Thus, under reasonable assumptions a mainstream IAM using updated scientific inputs yields evidence consistent with the SCC not being significantly greater than zero.

It should also be noted that the SCC is focused on the social costs of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use. It does not measure the private marginal benefits to consumers and society from the availability of fossil fuels. Public willingness to pay for fuels of all types indicates the value to society of reliable, abundant fossil energy. Tol (2017) estimates that the private benefit of carbon is large relative to the social cost. This can be illustrated by noting that the price of a gallon of gas indicates the marginal value to the consumer of the fuel. Suppose we assume a relatively high Social Cost of Carbon of, say, \$75 per tonne. Deflated by a MCPF value of 1.5 that would result in a carbon tax of \$50 per tonne, which equates to about 44 cents per gallon of gas (Lavelle 2019). A pre-tax price of \$3.00 per gallon would imply the marginal social benefit of the fuel is nearly seven times the marginal social cost.

13.3. Summary

It is increasingly being argued that the SCC is too variable to be useful for policymakers. Cambridge Econometrics (Thoung 2017) stated it's "time to kill it" due to uncertainties. The UK and EU no longer use SCC for policy appraisal, opting for "target-consistent" carbon pricing (UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero 2022, Dunne 2017). However the weaknesses of the SCC concept don't mean that other regulatory measures are inherently better or more efficient. Many climate regulations (such as electric vehicle mandates, renewable energy mandates, energy efficiency regulations and bans on certain types of home appliances) end up costing far more per tonne of abatement than a simple price on carbon emissions.

In summary, SCC estimates are highly uncertain due to unknowns in future economic growth, socioeconomic pathways, discount rates, climate damages, and system responses. The SCC is not intrinsically informative as to the economic or societal impacts of climate change. It provides an index connecting large networks of assumptions about the climate and the economy to a dollar value. Some assumptions yield a high SCC and others yield a low or negative SCC. The evidence for or against the underlying assumptions needs to be established independently; the resulting SCC adds no additional information about the validity of those assumptions.

Barrage, Lint and William Nordhaus (2024) Policies, projections, and the social cost of carbon: Results from the DICE-2023 model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (13) e2312030121 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2312030121>

Berg, Kimberly, Chadwick C Curtis and Nelson Mark. (2021) GDP and temperature: Evidence on cross-country response heterogeneity. NBER Working Paper 31327 June 2023 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31327>

Chris Thoung (2017) "Is It Time to Kill Off the Social Cost of Carbon?" Cambridge Econometrics Blog, September 14, 2017, <https://www.camecon.com/blog/time-kill-social-cost-carbon/>.

Daisy Dunne (2017), "Q&A: The Social Cost of Carbon," Carbon Brief, February 14, 2017, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/qa-social-cost-carbon/>

McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended Crop Yield Meta-analysis Data do not Support Upward SCC Revision. *Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>

Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>

Nordhaus, W. (1993) Optimal Greenhouse-Gas Reductions and Tax Policy in the "DICE" Model *American Economic Review* Vol. 83, No. 2, (Papers and Proceedings) pp.313-317.

Parry, Ian, Robertson C. Williams III and Lawrence H. Goulder (1999). "When Can Carbon Abatement Policies Increase Welfare? The Fundamental Role of Distorted Factor Markets." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 37: 52—84.

Resources for the Future (2025) "Social Cost of Carbon Explorer," Resources for the Future website, accessed April 22, 2025, <https://www.rff.org/publications/data-tools/scc-explorer/>.

Roe, Gerard H. and Yoram Bauman (2013) Climate Sensitivity: Should the climate tail wag the policy dog? *Climatic Change* (2013) 117:647–662 DOI 10.1007/s10584-012-0582-6

Sandmo, Agnar (1975) "Optimal Taxation in the Presence of Externalities." *Swedish Journal of Economics* 77 (1), 86–98.

Tol, R.S.J. (1997) On the optimal control of carbon dioxide emissions: an application of FUND *Environmental Modeling and Assessment* 2: 151–163.

Tol, Richard S.J. (2017). "The Private Benefit of Carbon and its Social Cost," Working Paper Series 0717, Department of Economics, University of Sussex Business School.
<https://ideas.repec.org/p/sus/susewp/0717.html>

UK Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (2022). "Carbon Valuation." GOV.UK, last updated April 4, 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/carbon-valuation--2>.

US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, "Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review", EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf accessed February 28, 2024.

Storm, S (2017) "How the Invisible Hand is Supposed to Adjust the Natural Thermostat: A Guide for the Perplexed." *Science and Engineering Ethics* vol 23: 1307—1331.

Pielke Jr., Roger (2020) Economic 'normalisation' of disaster losses 1998–2020: a literature review and assessment," *Environmental Hazards*, 2020, pp. 1-19

Pielke Jr., Roger (2018): Tracking progress on the economic costs of disasters under the indicators of the sustainable development goals, *Environmental Hazards*, DOI: 10.1080/17477891.2018.1540343

Formetta, Giuseppe and Luc Feyen (2019) Empirical evidence of declining global vulnerability to climate-related hazards. *Global Environmental Change* 57 101920
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.05.004>

Hu, Bin and Ross McKittrick (2015) Climatic Variations and the Market Value of Insurance Firms. *Journal of Insurance Issues* Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 92-111 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43741103>

Blickle, Kristian; Sarah N. Hamerling, and Donald P. Morgan (2021) : How bad are weather disasters for banks?, Staff Reports, No. 990, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, NY
<https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/247913/1/sr990.pdf>

Lavelle, Marianne (2019) Carbon Tax Plans: How They Compare and Why Oil Giants Support One of Them. *Inside Climate News* March 7, 2019 <https://insideclimatenews.org/news/07032019/carbon-tax-proposals-compare-baker-shultz-exxon-conocophillips-ccl-congress/>

14. U.S. Vehicle-Based CO₂ Emissions and the Global Climate

The EPA's 2009 Endangerment Finding focused on CO₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks in the U.S. because Section 202(a) of Clean Air Act mandates the EPA to set emissions standards for motor vehicles if pollutants are found to endanger public health or welfare. Thus, the 2009 Endangerment Finding obligated the EPA to regulate emissions from new motor vehicles.

Two questions that naturally arise are: (1) How large a reduction in CO₂ emissions would result from such regulation? and (2) What would be the climate impact of such regulation?

The first question can be addressed using CO₂ emissions statistics from the EPA and the International Energy Agency (IEA). The second question can be addressed by the fact that the reduction in global warming is proportional to how much global emissions are reduced, keeping in mind that how much the CO₂ content of the atmosphere increases in any given year is the result of total global CO₂ emissions, not just U.S. emissions.

In 2022, the emissions from U.S. cars and light duty trucks totaled 1.03 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide (GtCO₂). This is only 2.8% of the 36.8 GtCO₂ of global energy-related emissions in 2022. If we were to take into account emissions from land use and cement production, that fraction would be even smaller, but for the purpose of the following calculation, it will suffice.

Even if all CO₂ emissions were eliminated from U.S. cars and light duty trucks in 2022, the impact on global warming would be less than 3%. Would such a tiny impact even be measurable in global temperature data? For the period 1979-2023, which has the most extensive global coverage of a variety of weather data types, warming trends from five global temperature datasets range from +0.163 deg. C per decade from the NCEP/NCAR R1 reanalysis dataset to +0.211 deg. C per decade for the ERA5 reanalysis dataset. The latter estimate is 29% larger than the former, indicating that a 3% reduction in the rate of global warming from eliminating U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be an order of magnitude below the threshold of measurability. Given that global-average temperature is the most robust climate change metric, this means any other climate impacts (e.g. severe weather, floods, drought, etc.) from the elimination of U.S. vehicle CO₂ emissions would be even less significant.

References

EPA (2024): Fast Facts: U.S. Transportation Sector Greenhouse Gas Emissions 1990-2022. <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi?Dockkey=P101AKR0.pdf>

IEA (2023): CO₂ Emissions in 2022. <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/3c8fa115-35c4-4474-b237-1b00424c8844/CO2Emissionsin2022.pdf>

KNMI Climate Explorer. <https://climexp.knmi.nl/>

15. References

- Aldrin, M., M. Holden, P. Guttorp, R. B. Skeie, G. Myhre, and T. K. Berntsen, (2012): Bayesian estimation of climate sensitivity based on a simple climate model fitted to observations of hemispheric temperatures and global ocean heat content. *Environmetrics*, 23, 253-271. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/env.2140>
- Allen, M.R. and P.A. Stott (2003) Estimating Signal Amplitudes in Optimal Finger-Printing, Part I: Theory. *Climate Dynamics* 21:477–491. DOI 10.1007/s00382-003-0313-9
- Allen, M.R. and S.F.B. Tett (1999) Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics* 15: 419–434 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003820050291>.
- Arent, D.J., R.S.J. Tol, E. Faust, J.P. Hella, S. Kumar, K.M. Strzepek, F.L. Tóth, and D. Yan (2014) Key economic sectors and services. In: Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L.White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WGIIAR5-Chap10_FINAL.pdf
- Balcombe, Kevin, Iain Fraser and Abhijit Sharma (2019) Is radiative forcing cointegrated with temperature? A further examination using a structural time series approach." *Management of Environmental Quality* 30(5) DOI 10.1108/MEQ-12-2018-021.
- Bareille, F. and R. Chakir (2023) The impact of climate change on agriculture: A repeat-Ricardian analysis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 119
- Barker, D. (2023) Temperature Shocks and Economic Growth: Comment on Dell, Jones, and Olken. *Econ Journal Watch* 20(2) 234-253 <https://econjwatch.org/articles/temperature-shocks-and-economic-growth-comment-on-dell-jones-and-olken>
- Bates, J.R. (2016) Estimating climate sensitivity using two-zone energy balance models. *Earth and Space Science* 3, 207–225, doi:10.1002/2015EA000154. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/2015EA000154>
- Beenstock, M., Y. Reingewertz and N. Paldor (2012). "Polynomial cointegration tests of anthropogenic impact on global warming." *Earth System Dynamics* 3:173-188 doi:10.5194/esd-3-173-2012
- Bengtsson, Lennart and Stephen E. Schwartz (2013) Determination of a lower bound on Earth's climate sensitivity. *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology* 65(1) <https://b.tellusjournals.se/articles/10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.21533>
- Berg, Kimberly, Chadwick C Curtis and Nelson Mark. (2021) GDP and temperature: Evidence on cross-country response heterogeneity. NBER Working Paper 31327 June 2023 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31327>
- Burke, Marshall, Solomon M Hsiang, and Edward Miguel (2015). Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*, 527(7577):235–239.
- Butler, Ethan E., Nathaniel D. Mueller and Peter Huybers (2018) Peculiarly pleasant weather for US maize. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(47) 11935–11940 www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1808035115

- Challinor, Andrew J., et al. A meta-analysis of crop yield under climate change and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change* 4.4 (2014): 287.
- Charney, J., Arakawa, A., Baker, D. J., Bolin, B., Dickenson, R. E., Goody, R. M., Leith, C. E., Stommel, H. M., and Wunsch, C. I. (1979) Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A scientific assessment, Tech. rep., National Academy of Sciences, Woods Hole, MA, <https://doi.org/10.17226/12181>, 34 pp., 1979.
- Chen, H, SX Chen and M Mu (2023) A statistical review on the optimal fingerprinting approach in climate change studies. *Climate Dynamics* 62:1439-1446 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-023-06975-5>
- Christy, J.R. and McNider, R.T. (2017). Satellite bulk tropospheric temperatures as a metric for climate sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Science* 53(4) 511-518 DOI:10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z>
- Christy, JR. and R McNider (2017) Satellite Bulk Tropospheric Temperatures as a Metric for Climate Sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences* 53(4) 511—518. DOI:10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z
- CO2Science.org (undated) Plant growth archive
http://www.co2science.org/data/plant_growth/dry/dry_subject_b.php
- Connolly et al. (2019) Northern Hemisphere Snow-Cover Trends (1967–2018): A Comparison between Climate Models and Observations *Geosciences* 2019, 9(3), 135 <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3263/9/3/135>
- Dagsvik, J. K., Fortuna, M. and Hov Moen, S. (2020) How does the temperature vary over time? Evidence on the stationary and fractal feature of temperature fluctuations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, **183**, 883–908.
- Dagsvik, J.K and S Moen (2023) To what extent are temperature levels changing due to greenhouse gas emissions? Statistics Norway Discussion Paper 1007 September 2023.
- Davidson, James E.H., David B. Stephenson and Alemtsehai A. Turasie (2015) Time series modeling of paleoclimate data. *Environmetrics* 27(1) pp. 55-65 <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2373>
- Dayaratna, Kevin and Ross McKittrick (2023) "Reply to comment on "climate sensitivity, agricultural productivity and the social cost of carbon in fund" by Philip Meyer" *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 2023 link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10018-023-00364-2
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and Patrick J. Michaels (2020) Climate Sensitivity, Agricultural Productivity and the Social Cost of Carbon in FUND. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00263-w>
- Dell, Melissa, Benjamin F. Jones, and Benjamin A. Olken (2012). Temperature shocks and economic growth: Evidence from the last half century. *American economic journal: Macroeconomics*, 4(3):66–95, 2012. ISSN 1945-7707.
- Dergiades, T., R.K. Kaufmann and T. Panagiotidis (2016). Long-run changes in radiative forcing and surface temperature: The effect of human activity over the last five centuries. *Journal of Environmental*

Economics and Management 76:67—85.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0095069615000911>

Deryng, D., Elliott, J., Folberth, C. *et al.* (2021) Regional disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO₂ concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nature Climate Change* 6, 786–790 (2016).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2995>

Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K. C., Collins, W., Dufresne, J.-L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Palmer, M. D., Watanabe, M., Wild, M., and Zhang, H. (2021): The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V. *et al.* (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Greßer, Christina, Daniel Meierrieks, and David Stadelmann (2021) The link between regional temperature and regional incomes: econometric evidence with sub-national data. *Economic Policy*, 36(107):523–550, 2021.

Hall, Alex and Syukuro Manabe (1997) The Role of Water Vapor Feedback in Unperturbed Climate Variability and Global Warming. *Journal of Climate* August 1999 Vol 12 pp. 2327—2346.

Hegerl, G.C., F. W. Zwiers, P. Braconnot, N.P. Gillett, Y. Luo, J.A. Marengo Orsini, N. Nicholls, J.E. Penner and P.A. Stott, 2007: Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Hourdin, F, T Mauritsen, A Gettelman *et al.* (2017) The Art and Science of Climate Model Tuning. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 98, 589–602, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00135.1>.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2835> 2023.

Hu, Shaowu, Yunxia Wang and Lianxin Yang (2021) Response of rice yield traits to elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and its interaction with cultivar, nitrogen application rate and temperature: A meta-analysis of 20 years FACE studies, *Science of The Total Environment*, 764, 142797,
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142797>.

IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (2013) Chapter 10 online Supplemental Material. Available online at https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/07/WGI_AR5_Chap.10_SM.pdf

Johansson D.J.A, Brian C. O'Neill, Claudia Tebaldi and Olle Häggström (2015) Equilibrium climate sensitivity in light of observations over the warming hiatus *Nature Climate Change* DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2573 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2573>

Karl, T. R., S. J. Hassol, C. D. Miller, and W. L. Murray (2006). *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences*. Synthesis and Assessment Product. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. <http://www.climate-science.gov/Library/sap/sap1-1/finalreport/sap1-1-final-all.pdf>. Accessed August 3 2010.

- Klotzbach PJ, Pielke Sr RA, Pielke Jr RA, Christy JR, McNider RT. 2009. An alternative explanation for differential temperature trends at the surface and in the lower troposphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **114**: D21102. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2009JD011841>
- Koop, G (2008) *Introduction to Econometrics*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Lee, Sukyoung, Peter R. Bannon, Mingyu Park & Joseph P. Clark (2024) Zonal Contrasts of the Tropical Pacific Climate Predicted by a Global Constraint. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences* Volume 60, pages 669–678 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13143-024-00373-5>
- Lewis, N (2022) Objectively combining climate sensitivity evidence. *Climate Dynamics* 60: 3139—3165 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06468-x>
- Lewis, N. and J.A. Curry, C., (2015). The implications for climate sensitivity of AR5 forcing and heat uptake estimates. *Climate Dynamics*, 10.1007/s00382-014-2342-y. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/2f4994e4ab3a28571ecdff2edb3aeb13/>
- Lewis, N., (2013) An objective Bayesian, improved approach for applying optimal fingerprint techniques to estimate climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 26, 7414-7429. <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00473.1>
- Lewis, N., and J. Curry, 2018: The impact of recent forcing and ocean heat uptake data on estimates of climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D17-0667.1. <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0667.1>
- Lewis, N.: Objectively combining climate sensitivity evidence, *Climate Dynamics* 60, 3139-3165, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06468-x>, 2022.
- Loehle, C., (2014). A minimal model for estimating climate sensitivity. *Ecological Modelling*, 276, 80-84 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380014000404>
- Masters, T., 2014: Observational estimate of climate sensitivity from changes in the rate of ocean heat uptake and comparison to CMIP5 models. *Climate Dynamics*, 42,2173-2181 DOI 10.1007/s00382-013-1770-4. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-013-1770-4>
- McKittrick, R (2022a) Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting: a comment. *Climate Dynamics* 58:405-511 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05913-7>
- McKittrick, Ross and John R. Christy (2018) A Test of the Tropical 200-300mb Warming Rate in Climate Models. *Earth and Space Science* doi: 10.1029/2018EA000401. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2018EA000401>
- McKittrick, Ross and John R. Christy (2020) Pervasive Warm Bias in CMIP6 Tropospheric Layers. *Earth and Space Science* Vol 7(9) September 2020 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2020EA001281>
- McKittrick, Ross R (2022b) On the choice of TLS versus OLS in climate signal detection regression. *Climate Dynamics* 10.1007/s00382-022-06315-z
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2023) "TLS bias in climate fingerprinting regressions with heterogeneous noise variances and correlated explanatory variables" *Environmetrics*
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Consistent Climate Fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics* accepted for publication.
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended crop yield meta-analysis data do not support upward SCC revision. *Nature Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>

- Mendelsohn, R., Morrison, W., Schlesinger, M. E., & Andronova, N. G. (2000). Country-specific market impacts of climate change. *Climatic Change*, 45(3-4), 553-569.
- Mendelsohn, R., Nordhaus, W. D., & Shaw, D. (1994). The impact of global warming on agriculture: a Ricardian analysis. *The American Economic Review*, Sept 1994 753-771.
- Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>
- Moore, Frances C. and Delavane B. Diaz (2015) Temperature impacts on economic growth warrant stringent mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(2):127–131, 2015. ISSN 1758-678X.
- Newell, Richard G., Brian C. Prest, and Steven E. Sexton (2021). The GDP-temperature relationship: Implications for climate change damages. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 108 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102445>
- Nordhaus, William (2006). Geography and macroeconomics: New data and new findings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(10):3510–3517, 2006. ISSN 0027-8424.
- Nordhaus, William. (2018) Projections and Uncertainties About Climate Change in an Era of Minimal Climate Policies. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* August 2018, 10(3): 333-360. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/pol.20170046>
- Otto, A, Otto, FEL, Allen, MR, Boucher, O, Church, J, Hegerl, G, Forster, PM, Gillett, NP, Gregory, J, Johnson, GC, Knutti, R, Lohmann, U, Lewis, N, Marotzke, J, Stevens, B, Myhre, G and Shindell, D (2013) Energy budget constraints on climate response. *Nature Geoscience*, 6, 415–416. <https://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo1836>
- Philipona, R. et al., 2018: Radiosondes Show That After Decades of Cooling, the Lower Stratosphere Is Now Warming. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123(22), 12509–512522, doi:10.1029/2018jd028901. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2018JD028901>
- Razzak, Weshah A. (2022). "The Econometrics of Global Warming," *Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, vol. 65(2), pages 13-47.
- Resources for the Future (RFF) (2025). Global Energy Outlook online reference tool <https://www.rff.org/publications/data-tools/global-energy-outlook/> accessed April 18, 2025.
- Ring, M.J., D. Lindner, E.F. Cross and M. E. Schlesinger (2012) Causes of the Global Warming Observed since the 19th Century. *Atmospheric and Climate Sciences*, 2, 401-415. https://file.scirp.org/pdf/ACS20120400002_59142760.pdf
- Roe GH, Baker MB (2007) Why is climate sensitivity so unpredictable? *Science* 318:629–632
- Rutgers University Snow Lab (undated) <http://climate.rutgers.edu/snowcover/index.php>
- Scaffeta, N (2023) CMIP6 GCM ensemble members versus global surface temperatures. *Climate Dynamics* 60, 3091–3120 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06493-w>
- Schelling, Thomas C (1992) Some economics of global warming. *The American Economic Review*, 82 (1):1–14.
- Schwartz, Stephen E., Robert J. Charlson and Henning Rodhe (2007) Quantifying climate change — too rosy a picture? *Nature Reports-Climate Change* Vol 2 pp. 23-24.
- Seager, R., Cane, M., Henderson, N., Lee, D. E., Abernathey, R., and Zhang, H. (2019): Strengthening tropical Pacific zonal sea surface temperature gradient consistent with rising greenhouse gases, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 9, 517-522, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0505-x>, 2019

- Shaviv, Nir J., Henrik Svensmark and Jan Veizer (2023) *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1519:7—19. <https://nyaspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1111/nyas.14920>
- Sherwood, S. C., and Forest, C. E.: (2024) Opinion: Can uncertainty in climate sensitivity be narrowed further?, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 24, 2679-2686, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-2679-2024>.
- Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C., Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel, K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T., Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., Heydt, A. S., Knutti, R., Mauritsen, T., Norris, J. R., Proistosescu, C., Rugenstein, M., Schmidt, G. A., Tokarska, K. B., and Zelinka, M. D. (2020) An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence, *Review of Geophysics*, 58, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000678>.
- Simpson, I et al. (2024) Observed humidity trends in dry regions contradict climate models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2024 Vol. 121 No. 1 e2302480120 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2302480120>
- Skeie, R.B., T. Berntsen, M. Aldrin, M. Holden, and G. Myhre. A lower and more constrained estimate of climate sensitivity using updated observations and detailed radiative forcing time series. *Earth System Dynamics* 5, 139–175, 2014 doi:10.5194/esd-5-139-2014. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/05f113e95581027c9a9f0f0a2a1551ac/>
- Spencer, Roy (2024) Global Warming: Observations vs. Climate Models. Heritage Foundation January 2024 <https://www.heritage.org/environment/report/global-warming-observations-vs-climate-models>
- Spencer, Roy W. and John R. Christy (2024) Effective climate sensitivity distributions from a 1D model of global ocean and land temperature trends, 1970–2021 *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 155 pp. 299-308. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00704-023-04634-7>
- Stern, D and R. Kaufmann (2000) “Detecting a global warming signal in hemispheric temperature series: A structural time series analysis.” *Climatic Change* 47:411-438.
- Storm, S (2017) “How the Invisible Hand is Supposed to Adjust the Natural Thermostat: A Guide for the Perplexed.” *Science and Engineering Ethics* vol 23: 1307—1331.
- Taylor, Charles and Wolfram Schlenker (2023) Environmental drivers of agricultural productivity growth: CO2 fertilization of US field crops. National Bureau of Economic Research Working paper 29320, <http://www.nber.org/paper/w29320>
- Tol, Richard (2002) “Estimates of the Damage Costs of Climate Change” *Environmental and Resource Economics* 21:47—73
- US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, “Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review”, EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf

- Vogelsang, T and N. Nawaz (2016) "Estimation and Inference of Linear Trend Slope Ratios With an Application to Global Temperature Data." *Journal of Time Series Analysis*
doi.org/10.1111/jtsa.12209 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jtsa.12209>
- Yang, Yimin, Fei Jia, and Haoran Li. Estimation of panel data models with mixed sampling frequencies (2023). *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3):514–544.
- Zhao, Xiaobing, Mason Gerety, and Nicolai V. Kuminoff (2018) Revisiting the temperature-economic growth relationship using global subnational data. *Journal of environmental management*, 223:537–544, 2018.

16. Glossary of Terms

2XCO₂: doubling of the atmospheric CO₂ content relative to pre-Industrial times, a commonly used baseline for addressing climate change. In 2025, atmospheric CO₂ concentrations were approximately 50% of the way to 2XCO₂.

ABATEMENT: in the context of pollution, the reduction of harmful impacts through pollution reductions

ACE (Accumulated Cyclone Energy): a statistical measure of a tropical cyclone's energy accumulated over its lifetime, calculated from a summation of the square of maximum sustained wind speeds

ACIDIFICATION: a commonly used term for the reduction in ocean pH from more alkaline to less alkaline values

AEROSOLS: tiny solid or liquid particles suspended in the air

ALKALINE: having a chemical pH greater than 7.0. The "opposite" of acidic, which means a pH less than 7.0

AMBIENT: relating to the immediate surroundings of something

ANTHROPOGENIC: created by humans

AR (IPCC Assessment Reports): periodic assessments published by the IPCC evaluating current knowledge of the climate system, global change, and associated issues. The most recent was AR6 in 2023.

BIOMASS: the total quantity or weight of organic matter in a given area or volume

CARBON: popular and widely used shorthand term for carbon dioxide

CMIP (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project): The IPCC's organized effort to compare many different global ocean-atmosphere climate models when they are all forced with the same emissions scenario(s)

CONUS: the contiguous 48 U.S. states

DICE (Dynamic Integrated model of the Climate and Economy): An Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) developed by William Nordhaus in 1993.

DISCOUNT RATE: here, the rate used to convert future costs and benefits of environmental regulations into their present value. A high discount rate reduces the present value of future environmental benefits from regulating sooner; a low discount rate favors long-term benefits of regulating sooner.

DRY ICE: frozen carbon dioxide

ECONOMETRICS: the branch of economics concerned with the use of math and statistics in describing economic systems

ECS (Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity): The total amount of eventual global-average surface warming in response to a hypothetical doubling of the atmospheric CO₂ concentration compared to pre-Industrial levels.

EL NIÑO: the warm phase of ENSO, involving weaker upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and weaker Pacific trade winds.

EMISSIONS SCENARIO: An assumed scenario of future greenhouse gas emissions (or resulting atmospheric concentrations) based upon assumptions regarding global economic activity, the prevalence of fossil fuel use, and (sometimes) global carbon cycle model estimates of the rate of CO₂ uptake by land and ocean.

ENDANGERMENT FINDING (EF): the 2009 finding by the Administrator of the EPA that CO₂ emissions endanger human health and welfare

ENSO: El Niño – Southern Oscillation, a prominent natural climate fluctuation involving year-to-year variations in the upwelling of cold water off the equatorial coast of South America and associated strengthening or weakening of trade winds across the Pacific Ocean

FACE: (Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment) large-scale open-air studies that expose plants to elevated CO₂ levels, simulating future climate scenarios.

FOSSIL FUEL: a natural fuel such as coal or natural gas formed in the geological past from the remains of living organisms

FUND: An Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) developed by Richard Tol in 1997.

GBR (Great Barrier Reef): the world's largest coral reef ecosystem located off the northeast coast of Australia

GDP (Gross Domestic Product): total market value of all the final goods and services produced within a country's border, usually over one year

GHCN: the Global Historical Climatology Network, consisting of a time-varying number of globally distributed weather stations making hourly, daily, or monthly measurements of precipitation, temperature and sometimes snowfall and snow depth.

GLOBAL GREENING: the satellite-observed increase in greenness in most vegetated land areas observed since the early 1980s

GNP (Gross National Product): total market value of all the final goods and services produced by the citizens a country, usually over one year

GREENHOUSE EFFECT (GHE): the tendency for any planetary atmosphere containing greenhouse gases to be warmer in the lowest layers than if those gases did not exist.

GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG): an atmospheric gas that absorbs and emits infrared (IR) radiation, especially water vapor, CO₂, and methane.

HURST PHENOMENON: see long term persistence.

HYDROLOGY: the study of the movement of water, especially on land and the atmosphere

IAM (Integrated Assessment Model): a computerized tool that combines economics, climate science, and social sciences to provide quantitative relationships between human and Earth systems, helping to inform policy decisions

IEA: International Energy Agency

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change): A panel of international experts and governmental representatives established by the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization in 1988 to provide governments at all levels with scientific information that they can use to develop climate policies

IR (Infrared): heat radiation that all solid objects and greenhouse gases emit by virtue of their temperature.

LA NIÑA: the cool phase of ENSO, involving stronger upwelling of cold water off the South American coast and stronger Pacific trade winds.

LONG TERM PERSISTENCE (LTP, or HURST PHENOMENON): the tendency for natural systems such as precipitation, droughts, and floods to have persisting behavior over time, as opposed to random behavior, which impacts our interpretation of long-term trends in climate data

MAIZE: corn

MODEL: a computer code or collection of codes which quantify our knowledge of various processes and the interactions between those processes

MORTALITY: death or number of deaths, usually expressed for a specific population and period

NCA (National Climate Assessment): A periodic report mandated by the Global Change Research Act of 1990 summarizing the impact of climate change on the United States> There have been five NCA reports: NCA1 (2000), NCA2 (2009), NCA3 (2014), NCA4 (2017-18), and NCA5 (2023)

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development): a specific list of 38 countries having a democratic system of government and free economic systems

PALEOCLIMATE: climate of the distant past, before modern weather instruments were widely used (typically pre-1850), necessitating the use of “proxy” measurements such as tree rings, ice core, pollen records, etc.

PDI (Power Dissipation Index): a statistical estimate of the accumulated destructive potential of a tropical cyclone over time, calculated as a summation of the cube of the maximum sustained wind speeds

PHOTOSYNTHESIS: the process by which plants grow, requiring carbon dioxide, water, and light at sufficiently warm temperatures (10 to 35 deg. C for optimal function)

PPM: parts per million, a measure of the concentration of a substance in (for example) the atmosphere

PRE-INDUSTRIAL: the historical period before which human greenhouse gas emissions were considered significant, usually assumed to be the mid-1700s

RADIATIVE FEEDBACK: a change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in surface temperature

RADIATIVE FORCING: the change in the balance between absorbed solar radiation and emitted infrared (IR) radiation, referenced to the top of the atmosphere, caused by changes in greenhouse gases, anthropogenic aerosols, volcanoes, etc.

RCP SCENARIOS: Representative Concentration Pathways, different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5). RCP scenarios have a number label (e.g. RCP6.0) indicating how much radiative forcing they assume in 2100 relative to pre-Industrial times, in Watts per sq. meter. RCP4.5 and RCP6.0 are intermediate scenarios, whereas RCP8.5 is an extreme scenario with very large future emissions of greenhouse gases.

RICARDIAN ANALYSIS: a method used in environmental economics to estimate the economic impacts of climate change, particularly on agriculture

SOCIAL COST OF CARBON (SCC): an estimate of the total economic damages, measured in dollars, caused by emitting one additional ton of CO₂ into the atmosphere

SSP SCENARIOS: Shared Socioeconomic Pathways, different scenarios for future greenhouse gas emissions and their impact on the atmosphere, introduced in the IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6). Some of the SSP scenarios are analogous to the older RCP scenarios, for purposes of continuity and comparison to earlier climate model assessments.

TC: tropical cyclone

TMAX: the daily maximum surface air temperature

TMIN: the daily minimum surface air temperature

TOA: top of atmosphere

TOXICOLOGY: the study of the adverse effects of chemical substances on living organisms.

TREND: usually, the linear regression slope fit to a time series of data, one of the most commonly used metrics to describe climate change over a long period of time

UHI (Urban Heat Island): the tendency for inhabited areas to be warmer than their rural surroundings, due to the replacement of natural land and vegetation with roads, parking lots, buildings, and waste heat sources.

USHCN: the U.S. Historical Climatology Network, consisting of quality-controlled temperature and precipitation data from 1,218 surface weather stations

17. About the authors

John Christy, Ph.D.

Judith Curry, Ph.D.

Steven Koonin, Ph.D.

Ross McKittrick, Ph.D.

Roy Spencer, Ph.D.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 9:25 AM
To: John Christy
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Steve Koonin; Jeremy T. Ison; Roy W. Spencer
Subject: Tim Palmer

Excellent article published in Nature from Tim Palmer. He has asked that I forward this to relevant DOE people. Note: Tim is on our list of recommended external reviewers

https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-025-02508-8.epdf?sharing_token=HstcggvGxjTK2HXWLMrdjdRgN0jAjWel9jnR3ZoTv0MpCah-apSljEQsE_VknzPT9SYV2jq4oGt5SpdCPzG_UbOdeVvpQ5gx9gai_dq6uJRmRnRFPc9kHiz2fvVmQf6cwJq61ZLFeBwbjMLctiwYqXetgiYVJVnbHWDXMaP0bg%3D

On Sat, Aug 9, 2025 at 10:02 AM John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com> wrote:
I'm available. W Th F 0900 to 1200 ET also.

John C.

John Christy
Director, Earth System Science Center
Professor, Atmos and Earth Science
Alabama State Climatologist
The University of Alabama in Huntsville
climateman60@gmail.com

On Aug 9, 2025, at 9:10 AM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

I'm available same times as Steve. Not available after noon Friday.

On Sat, Aug 9, 2025 at 10:08 AM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
I'm generally available

On Sat, Aug 9, 2025 at 6:57 AM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:
I'm at Stanford next week and available 0900-1200 ET on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday.

Others?

Steven E. Koonin

On Aug 8, 2025, at 17:18, Ison, Jeremy T. <jeremy.ison@hq.doe.gov> wrote:

All,

Thank you for your patience as I take on this coordination role at DOE.

I would like to set up an introductory call for mid-next week to introduce myself and discuss next steps.

Going forward, please treat me as your single point of contact for DOE.

I'm looking forward to working with you all.

Thank you,

Jeremy Ison



To help protect
your privacy,
Microsoft Office
prevented
automatic
download of this
picture from the
Internet.

Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



To help protect
your privacy,
Microsoft Office
prevented
automatic
download of this
picture from the
Internet.

Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@cfanclimate.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 3:28 PM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Roy W. Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Tipping points

I'm working on the tipping points text. It isn't working in context of the extreme weather chapter (AOMC, WAIS, etc), i think it will work better in the SCC chapter, since extreme outcomes have big influence on SCC. If you agree with this strategy, I will work offline with RM on this

On Thu, May 15, 2025 at 12:09 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Yes, we should combine as Judy suggests.

SEK

PS There is already a separate thread on the coral issue.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@cfanclimate.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 8:30 AM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>
Cc: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>; John Christy <climatemanager60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: Part I

Another thought I had last night (instead of sleeping)

I suggest combining chapters 2 and 3 into one chapter:

- 2. Direct environmental impacts of CO2
 - 2.1 Land - global greening
 - 2.2 Ocean - alkalinity

In the alkalinity chapter, I think we should remove discussion of coral reefs, since that is mostly a temperature issue

On Wed, May 14, 2025 at 4:18 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

That works. Thanks.

SEK

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 7:17 PM

To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>

Cc: Judith Curry <curry.judith@cfanclimate.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: New folder: 01.Report Draft

This should get you in

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=l1z3qj9v46elt5f4ywwwxq7p8c&dl=0

This is for the parent folder. Let me know if it doesn't work.

On Wed, May 14, 2025 at 6:41 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Can you please send a link to the new folder?

Thanks.

Steven E. Koonin

> On May 14, 2025, at 15:27, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

> Following our meeting today I created a new folder containing clean copies (all past tracked changes accepted) of all chapters.

> There are some marginal queries and in-line comments remaining to be resolved, missing Figure captions in a couple of places etc. If you are able to supply the missing info go ahead and do so. We will soon need to sign off on final text versions so please read through them.

> I propose that these should be the versions we talk through next week.

>

> Question: should there be a single list of references at the very end or should each chapter have its own reference list? Initially I thought the former but now I lean towards the latter.

>

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2025 6:33 PM
To: Judith Curry; Roy W. Spencer; John Christy; Travis Fisher; Steven Koonin
Subject: Title

I have the following as a placeholder in the template document

- An Assessment of the Risks Posed by Carbon Dioxide Emissions on the United States of America

Travis suggested this might be improved upon. Any suggestions?

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 9:06 AM
To: Roy W. Spencer; Judith Curry; John Christy; Steven Koonin
Subject: Today

We'll meet at 11 to go through Ch 12. Should only take 15 mins.
I've noted the changes made in various chapters since yesterday and we will review those quickly.

Then we can discuss the report title and what we call ourselves. I haven't had any guidance from Travis on legal implications associated with our group name but he's meeting with the department GC tomorrow so he'll bring it up.

DoE Team Doc Review
Wednesday, May 21 · 11:00am – 1:30pm
Time zone: America/Toronto
Google Meet joining info
Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/zen-dnbt-mpj>

Remaining matters:

The intro/preface

Author bios

Travis asked yesterday to check if our preference is still to publish the report prior to and separate from any EPA action, let's discuss.

Timing: CW leaves the DoE at 2 PM tomorrow and wants to have a draft to read on his flight to California. Travis and Josh have been assembling the chapters we completed into a report template. There will be time for tweaks and corrections up to about noon on Thursday.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2025 5:57 PM
To: John Christy
Cc: Steve Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Roy Spencer
Subject: tornadoes

I am in discussion with Tim Palmer on the climate sensitivity issue

I also added a paragraph to tornado section, based on feedback from the tropical listserv

Apart from the trends in total US tornadoes, the spatial distribution of US tornadoes shows significant variability. In recent decades, the U.S. has seen a broad shift in tornadoes to the east and to occur earlier in the year (Graber et al., 2024). Tippet et al. (2016) found that more tornadoes are clustered into larger outbreaks, although they assessed that this trend did not appear to be associated from human caused climate change. Winter tornadoes have become more frequent over the eastern U.S., notably in the southeast and Midwest (particularly Kentucky, Illinois and Indiana). There has been a steady decline in tornadoes in the traditional spring and summer tornado season and across the Great Plains (Graber et al. 2024) especially across the Great Plains. These findings highlight the need to better understand the role of internal climate variability and anthropogenic forcing in modulating tornado activity.

Graber, M., Trapp, R.J. & Wang, Z. The regionality and seasonality of tornado trends in the United States. *npj Clim Atmos Sci* **7**, 144 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-024-00698-y>

Tippet, MK, C. LePore, and JE Cohen (2016) More tornadoes in the most extreme tornado outbreaks. *Science Reports*, 354 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aah7393>


On Wed, Aug 13, 2025 at 2:18 PM John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com> wrote:
Excellent Judy. Were many of the newly included studies cited in the IPCC?

I'm having conversations with the Dessler group ... being completely helpful with data and methods used in Chapter 6.

John C.

On Wed, Aug 13, 2025 at 3:13 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
See attached revisions to the hurricane section. I think this strengthens the text without diluting our main points. I look forward to your feedback/comments.

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



To help protect
your privacy,
Outlook prevented
automatic
download of this
picture from the
Internet.

Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]
Sent: 6/7/2025 10:44:26 PM
To: John Christy [climatemanager60@gmail.com]
CC: Steve Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; Roy W. Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Josh Loucks [loucksj14@gmail.com]; seth.cohen@hq.doe.gov
Subject: Traceable accounts
Attachments: TraceableAccounts.docx

Text attached

On Sat, Jun 7, 2025 at 3:27 PM John Christy <climatemanager60@gmail.com> wrote:

All

How will we handle Key Message 2.2? This covers much of what we've analyzed. We've got heat waves, downpours, hurricanes and wildfires (Oh My!) here. This thing is a real target-rich environment.

[Key Message 2.2] Extreme Events Are Becoming More Frequent and Severe

Observations show an increase in the severity, extent, and/or frequency of multiple types of extreme events. Heatwaves have become more common and severe in the West since the 1980s (high confidence). Drought risk has been increasing in the Southwest over the past century (very high confidence), while at the same time rainfall has become more extreme in recent decades, especially east of the Rockies (very high confidence). Hurricanes have been intensifying more rapidly since the 1980s (high confidence) and causing heavier rainfall and higher storm surges (high confidence). More frequent and larger wildfires have been burning in the West in the past few decades due to a combination of climate factors, societal changes, and policies (very high confidence).

I like the last sentence that says to me, "Wildfires are increasing in the West due to increases in everything that makes wildfires increase."

Also, as evidence of wandering outside of the congressional guardrails how about all those sections on "Climate Action"

John C.

John Christy
Director, Earth System Science Center
Professor, Atmos and Earth Science
Alabama State Climatologist
The University of Alabama in Huntsville
climatemanager60@gmail.com

On Jun 7, 2025, at 3:38 PM, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Attached is the latest draft that reflects discussion we had this afternoon, as well as edits Judy sent around a few hours ago.


A few specifics:

- Travis et al to work on the charge letter appearing in Appendix I
- Seth to produce some text summarizing legal guidance on NCA requirements and process
- We'll frame deficiencies as two types – endemic (with a few examples of each) and specific; perhaps try our hand at how we're rewrite key findings to reflect deficiencies we identify. Try to keep each item to a single page.
- Suggest we reconvene Tuesday June 10 at noon EDT (I'll be at Stanford). Let Josh know if that works for you.

Steve Koonin

<NCA5 report Jun7[SEK][JC].docx>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

Traceable accounts

Starting with the NCA3, the NCA has included a section on Traceable Accounts at the end of each Chapter. A description from the NCA5:

“Each chapter concludes with a section entitled Traceable Accounts, which provides information on the overall process used to develop the chapter as well as a separate Traceable Account section for each Key Message. These Traceable Accounts describe the supporting evidence behind each Key Message, the process and rationale authors used in reaching their conclusions, and the author team’s expert assessment of the confidence in and, where applicable, likelihood of these conclusions. As such, Traceable Accounts provide information about the state of the science, document sources of uncertainty, identify research gaps, and allow traceability to data and resources.”

The Traceable Accounts for each Chapter and Key Message includes the following sections:

- Description of Evidence Base
- Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps
- Description of Confidence and Likelihood

The Traceable Accounts are in principle an important factor in addressing the NCA’s statutory requirement to discuss scientific uncertainties. Further, the Traceable Accounts can help satisfy the Executive Order for Restoring Gold Standard Science with regards to: reproducibility, transparency, communication of error and uncertainty, and skepticism of findings and assumptions.

However, the execution of the Traceable Accounts is uneven, often superficial and noninformative in Chapters 2 and 3 (which were the only Chapters investigated here). An example from Chapter 2:

Key Message 2.2: Extreme Events are Becoming More Frequent and Severe. Description of the Evidence base consists of two paragraphs, with the first paragraph summarizing the findings and the second paragraph is a generic description of the types of data that can be used for storms. Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps focuses on the uneven distribution across US populations due to differences in exposure and vulnerability. The only limitations in data referred to are the lack of a long-term record of lightning and the lack of homogenized daily and hourly temperature data, except from reanalysis products. The most astonishing deficiency is in the Description of Confidence and Likelihood. One of the statements in Key Message 2.2 is: “Hurricanes have been intensifying more rapidly since the 1980s (high confidence) and causing heavier rainfall and higher storm surges (high confidence).” The Description of Confidence and Likelihood includes the following statement: “Basic physical understanding and climate models both provide robust explanations for the links between climate change and observed changes in these extremes: this is why the authors also have high confidence that storms are delivering more rainfall and high confidence that storm surges are becoming higher.” No reference to journal publications or a specific data set is made in the Chapter regarding hurricane induced precipitation or storm surge to support this *high confidence* conclusion. **NOTE: WE CAN DELETE THE TOPICAL ANALYSIS OF HURRICANES**

With regards to Chapter 3, there are some substantial inconsistencies between the Traceable Accounts for the different Key Findings:

Key Message 3-1: Human activities have caused global warming. Confidence and Likelihood: “There is *very high confidence* that emissions of GHGs from human activities, fossil fuel use in particular, have *unequivocally* caused all global warming observed over the industrial era. There is also *very high confidence* that changes in natural climate drivers have had globally small and regionally variable long-term effects over this period.” The Uncertainties section only addresses uncertainties in radiative forcing of greenhouse gases.

By contrast, consider Key Message 3-4: Humans are changing Earth System processes. The Traceability Analysis in this section contains arguably the most scientifically credible text in the entire Chapter. From Description of Evidence Base: “In the last decade, there has been increasing recognition of the role of regional-scale natural variability in the past and future evolution of climate, as well as the fact that regional natural variability signals can be competitive with forced anthropogenic signals”. From Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps: “For example, the true natural variability of the climate system on decadal to centennial timescales could be larger than what we estimate from GCMs, which would further increase the irreducible uncertainty stemming from natural variability.”

As part of the Traceable Account: “Each figure and some tables are accompanied by a metadata survey, which can be accessed in the online version of the report by clicking on the eyeball icon above the figure or table (see the table below for explanations of additional icons used throughout the report). The metadata survey describes data sources, figure or table development methods, copyright information, and other important documentation.” Upon clicking on the eyeball icon above a particular figure, a Contact US email appears, addressed to the USGCRP. No attempt was made to send a email to elicit the Metadata information, but it is clear that this information is not readily accessible online.

In summary, the Traceable Analyses examined here, with few exceptions, fail to meet the stated objectives set forward by the NCA.

From: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2025 2:07 PM
To: Gmail SEK
Subject: Trump team readies more attacks on mainstream climate science - E&E News by POLITICO

<https://www.eenews.net/articles/trump-team-readies-more-attacks-on-mainstream-climate-science/>

Steven E. Koonin

From: John Christy [climateman60@gmail.com]
Sent: 7/22/2025 9:03:17 PM
To: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; Steve Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; Roy Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]; Josh Loucks [loucksj14@gmail.com]; Cohen, Seth [seth.cohen@hq.doe.gov]; Travis Fisher [travis.fisher@hq.doe.gov]
Subject: Updated Responses to Reviewers 1 and 6
Attachments: Reviewr_1_6_Responses_JRC.docx

Ross

see attached.

John C.

Reviewer #1 JRC comments. No need to add citation

36	1	A recent study attributes the bias to inter-annual availability and residual bias in the satellite record. The pre- and post 2000 have temperature records from two separate satellites and the discrepancy in the trends needs to be resolved[23] Ref 23 is worth adding I think Chung et al. 2024 (using output through 2014 only) confirm the models' too-high tropical tropospheric warming rates relative to observations and suggested two issues that might contribute to at least part of the discrepancy: (1) the differential phasing of natural, ephemeral events such as El Niños between models and observations and (2) a possible spurious cooling in UAH and NOAA/STAR satellite datasets around 2000. Regarding (1) we agree that the timing of major events like ENSOs diminishes the confidence of models-to-observations comparisons for short periods, but now with 46 years of record as well as two major El Niño warm events since 2014 in the observations, the results shown in Fig. 5.7 provide a more confident comparison as indicated by statistical significance results. Regarding (2) Christy et al. 2018 (and later Zou et al 2023) specifically examined the divergence around 2000 between UAH and NOAA/STAR vs. RSS and UW. We demonstrated that RSS and UW's use of the aging and drifting NOAA-14 MSU sensor relative to the new, highly calibrated NOAA-15 AMSU sensor contributed to a spurious warming in RSS and UW. Be that as it may, CWG Fig. 5.7 is clear in noting all models overestimate the tropical temperature trend relative to observations – model trends being more positive than observational datasets - even RSS, as well as two Reanalyses and the UAH and NOAA/STAR satellite products. Do we need to add ref [23] and a sentence to the text? I'll defer to John John has done the most detailed work on this, and don't the various satellite datasets now mostly agree with each other, especially in the tropics?
----	---	---

Reviewer #6. JRC comments

6	57	para 1	The conclusion "The rise in Tmin has been strongly related to the growing presence of manufactured surfaces around the weather stations over the last 100+ years (the so-called urban heat island effect; Section 3.3 and Spencer et al. 2025)." is only found in an author's self-citation of Spencer, et al, (2025) that does not appear in the references at the end of Chapter 6. Further, the trend of greater increases in Tmin relative to Tmax is documented and explained in Easterling, et al (1997). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5324.364; Thorne, et al (2016) https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024584. The trend cannot be attributed to UHI effects.
---	----	--------	--

			The citation of Thorne et al. 2016 is curious as there was no attempt to categorize data by urban size, since the authors utilized gridded (not station) data for their analysis – in fact the word “urban” does not appear in the article. There are many empirical studies which document the relative rise of TMin vs. TMax in urban areas, among the more established are Karl et al. 1988 and Runnalls and Oke 2006 who state about these effects, “differences of thermal microclimate are enhanced at night” using the simple metric (TMax – TMin). Spencer et al 2025 references many publications which also point to the same conclusion, and more importantly demonstrate that the UHI effect has its greatest impact when a site changes from extreme rural to less rural (as did Oke 1973). These results render Easterling et al. 1997 uninformative because their “nonurban” definition included cities with as many as 50,000 inhabitants, and thus their “nonurban” sample was heavily contaminated by UHI. As Spencer et al. 2025 show, the greatest impact occurs as populations increase from near zero to this level. The physics of the issue are discussed in Christy et al. 2009 and theoretically modeled in McNider et al. 2012 (see citations therein for other studies).
--	--	--	---

Include citations to Christy et al. 2009 (already in the list), for the increase in TMin relative to TMax in cities.

Karl, T.R., H.F. Diaz, and G. Kukla. 1988: Urbanization: Its detection and effect on the United States climate record. *J. Climate*, 1, 1099-1123. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1988\)001<1099:UIDAEI>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1988)001<1099:UIDAEI>2.0.CO;2)

Runnalls, K.E. and T.R. Oke, 2006: Technique to detect microclimate inhomogeneities in historical records of screen-level air temperature. *J. Climate*, 19, 959-978. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3663.1>

McNider, R.T., G.J. Steeneveld, A.A.M. Holtslag, R.A. Pielke Sr., S. Mackaro, A. Pour-Biazar, J. Walters, U. Nair, and J.R. Christy, **2012**: Response and sensitivity of the nocturnal boundary layer over land to added longwave radiative forcing. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D14106, doi:10.1029/2012JD017578.

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 9:32 AM
To: Ross McKittrick
Cc: Steve Koonin; John Christy; Judith Curry; Travis Fisher
Subject: US tornado writeup, with plots (1950-2024) for the severe weather chapter
Attachments: Changes in US tornadoes 1950-2024 [RS].docx

One notable class of US severe weather that has undergone long-term changes is tornadoes. Since statistics began in 1950, there has been a substantial decrease (by about 50%) in the number of strong to violent tornadoes 1950-2024, as is shown in Fig. Xa.




Fig. X. Annual U.S. tornado counts for (a) strong to violent tornadoes (EF3 to EF5), and (b) weak tornadoes (EF0 to EF2). Based upon NOAA Storms Prediction Center data, available at https://www.spc.noaa.gov/wcm/data/1950-2024_actual_tornadoes.csv

The number of weak tornadoes (Fig. Xb) went up from 1950 to 1990, a feature which is likely due to the spread of the U.S. population into what were rural areas, leading to more opportunities for weak tornadoes producing minimal damage to be observed. But between 1990 and 2024 there has been no increase. The reason for the difference is that strong to violent tornadoes leave much more damage which will be noticed later even if the tornado itself is not observed (tornado strength is measured by the damage it produces, not by the visual appearance of the funnel). But the identification of weak tornadoes has been aided by many more people covering a larger area, with increasing ability to take video with cell phones.

From: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:52 PM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Judith Curry; John Christy; Roy W. Spencer
Subject: Virtual meeting with the Secretary

Hi all,

You seem to be cooking with gas, as they say, so I'll keep this update short.

First, I'm hoping to squeeze us all in for a virtual meeting or phone call with the Secretary this Thursday afternoon. The time would likely be 2 pm to 2:30 pm ET, but we should keep some flexibility on the earlier end (try to keep your calendars clear from 1:15 pm to 2:30 pm ET). Feel free to come with questions for the Secretary, and if there's anything I can try to answer beforehand, please let me know.

Second, if we put together a rapid review team, who would you all feel comfortable including? Below my signature, I have a list of the names I've heard so far. My suggestion would be to either keep this group small or only solicit their input once the first draft is published--we have to weigh the benefit of external review against the risk of a leak. We have some flexibility in whether or how we do any review, so let me know if you have any strong preferences.

Best,
Travis

Possible review team

Roger Pielke Jr.
Cliff Mass
Will Happer
Richard Lindzen
Nick Lewis (UK)
Ryan Maue
Kevin Dayaratna

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 6:51 AM
To: Ross McKittrick; John Christy
Cc: Judith Curry; Travis Fisher; Steve Koonin
Subject: Why are our conclusions so different from those in 2009?

(As a reminder... I will join the meeting this morning as soon as I can).

Virtually none of the critics of our report (journalists, environmental groups, politicians, et al.) will actually read the report. So, they will resort to *ad hominin* attacks and any other non-scientific arguments to discredit what we've produced.

So, I think it might be useful to have a section, maybe just before the introduction, which would be a short list of talking points/sound bites (which we would refer to when we are interviewed) which summarize why our conclusions are so different from those supporting the 2009 Endangerment Finding. (Sorry if something like this is already in the works).

For example (in no particular order):

1. Many of the findings of the 2007 IPCC report relied upon in 2009 were misrepresented
2. The 2007 IPCC report neglected to include opposing scientific opinions
3. There have been many new scientific findings in the last two decades.
4. The future CO2 emissions scenario most relied upon in 2007 is now known to be wildly unrealistic.
5. The rate of global warming has been less than what climate models produce
6. The benefits of increasing CO2 in the atmosphere, as well as of moderating temperatures, have been ignored.

Pithy sound bites will be necessary to build support. There will not be time in interviews (or space in news articles) to go into details.

-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2025 10:39 PM
To: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Cc: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steve Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: urbanization bias

This would be a good place to make that point. Can you add a few sentences and a reference? Just put them in an email and I can paste it in. As I recall Dick McNider has a good paper on this.
Ross

On Sun, May 18, 2025 at 9:54 PM John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com> wrote:
Ross

Nice summary of how the IPCC ignored evidence. Is this the place to discuss the asymmetric impact of UHI and other aspects?, i.e. TMin much greater than TMax for physical reasons published as early as Oke 1973? Or is this a focussed description of the type of misdirection for which the IPCC is famous?

John C.

John Christy
Director, Earth System Science Center
Professor, Atmos and Earth Science
Alabama State Climatologist
The University of Alabama in Huntsville
climateman60@gmail.com

On May 18, 2025, at 7:59 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I like it

On Sun, May 18, 2025 at 5:33 PM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:
I added the following material to Ch 3, which we can discuss tomorrow - let me know what you think.

3.1.3 Urbanization

Historical temperature data over land has been collected mainly where people live. This raises the problem of how to filter out non-climatic warming signals due to Urban Heat Islands (UHI) and other changes to the land surface. If they are not removed the data may over-attribute observed warming to greenhouse gases. The IPCC acknowledges that raw temperature data are contaminated with UHI effects but claims to have data cleaning procedures that remove them. It is an open question whether those procedures suffice for the purpose.


The AR6 downplayed the issue by saying (WGI p. 235) that no recent evidence had emerged to alter the AR5 finding that urbanization causes an upward bias of no more than 10% in the global land surface warming trend. The AR5 (WGI p. 189) also cited the 10% upper bound without citing a source. The AR4 (WGI p. 244) cited Jones et al. (1990) and Peterson et al. (1999) as the basis of the claim. Peterson et al. had failed to find any difference in trends between rural and urban samples, although their definition of rural included local populations up to 10,000 persons and the relative influence of urbanization begins well below that (Spencer et al 2025). Jones et al. compared rural/urban warming in three regions: Eastern Australia, Eastern China and Western Soviet Union. Their definition of “rural” included towns of up to 10,000 in the former Soviet Union and up to 100,000 in China. They found relatively warming biases greater than 10% in these areas but conjectured that the urbanization effect averaged over the areas they did not examine would bring the global land bias to under 10% of the observed warming trend.

Prior to the IPCC AR4 several papers appeared in print arguing that the warming effect of UHIs added a relatively large (30-50%) component to observed warming and was not simulated by climate models (de Laat and Maurellis 2006, McKittrick and Michaels 2007). These findings were based on correlations between locations of maximum warming over land

with locations of maximum socioeconomic development. The AR4 asserted (p. 244) that these correlations were an artefact of natural atmospheric circulations and were in fact statistically insignificant, and on that basis set the findings aside. The claim attracted controversy because it was presented with no supporting evidence. McKittrick (2010) and McKittrick and Nierenberg (2010) showed that taking into account various conjectured alternative explanations for the correlations did not affect their significance. The AR5 (p. 189) conceded that the AR4 had provided “no explicit evidence” for its assessment and further acknowledged, based on these papers, that there was “significant evidence for such contamination of the record” i.e. a warming bias in the land record. However as noted, elsewhere in the report they carried forward the AR4 claim that it was less than 10% of observed warming and they expressed no caution against using the land record for climate measurement on the assumption that it is not contaminated with UHI bias.

Recently Soon et al. (2023) estimated an urbanization bias in the Northern Hemisphere land record over 1850-2018 sufficient to increase the trend in the blended record from 0.55°C to 0.89°C per century. Thus while there is clearly warming in the land record, there is also evidence that it is biased upward by patterns of urbanization and that these biases are not removed by the data processing algorithms used to produce climate data sets. Spencer et al. (2025) propose a new method for measuring UHI biases at local levels using new historical population archives, which may provide a way of further testing for and quantifying the urbanization biases in climate data.

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]
Sent: 5/18/2025 4:41:06 PM
To: Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; John Christy [climatemanager60@gmail.com]; Roy W. Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]
Subject: Work assignment for Travis - Reference lists
Attachments: RM.References.docx

Hi Travis

1 In the 01.Report Drafts folder Chapters 10 & 11 are now merged. Please renumber Ch 12 to 11 and 13 to 12.

2: References

I've attached a list of references I was compiling earlier in the project when I thought there would just be one list at the end. But instead we will have reference lists at the end of each chapter. At this point there are conflicting formats. Some are entered as superscripts and some as (name, date) insertions. I'd like you and Josh to go through every chapter and put all the citations into a common format. You can save the file thus edited with a [REF] insertion in the name.

The format in the text should be (Last name date) with a reference list at the end of each chapter. For the in-text citation note the following examples

... Connolly et al. (2023) found that ...

... Pielke and Ritchie (2020) reported new studies

... to be intercalibrated with the prior system (Zacharias 2014, Scafetta et al. 2019).

... distributed over the daily solar cycle (Curry and Webster, 1999).

Keys:

(Last name date) do not include first initials and no comma between name and date

If two names include both

If 3 or more, include the first and then et al. (period after al)

If the citation is the subject of a sentence only the year goes in brackets.

Where there is a superscript you'll need to convert to the inline citation and move the footnoted reference to the end of the chapter.

references:

Use the full name of journals, not short forms (*Journal of Climate* not *J Clim*)

Journal names and book names in italics

The year goes after the author name(s) and before the article title

If there are more than 4 authors list the first 3 and then say et al.

Author names: first entry is Last name, First name; then the rest are First name, last name

If the full first name is shown, leave it as such, if only the first initial(s) is shown leave it. I prefer the full first names but you don't need to look up missing names.

Zelinka, M. D., T. A. Myers, D. T. McCoy, et al. (2020). Causes of higher climate sensitivity in CMIP6 models. *Geophysical Research Letters* 47, e2019GL085782. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085782>

The citation detail depends a bit on the age of the article. It used to be *Journal Vol(issue)* but now the most important identifier is the DOI number and/or hyperlink so an active hyperlink should be included wherever possible.

The reference list should be alphabetized. If there are multiple citations for the same author(s) and year use a,b,c etc., as in Lewis (2022a), Lewis (2022b) or the in-line citation and then carry the a or b to the year in the corresponding reference list entry.

As chapter reference lists have grown some of the underlying text may have been removed so there may be entries in the existing reference lists that are no longer needed, and there may be in-line citations with no reference in the list. Check my master list, otherwise flag citations for which no reference is provided.

For the text submitted using superscript references, after the first appearance of a citation subsequent superscripts will have a footnote saying something like *ibid* or *op. cit.* Those need to be converted to the corresponding (name date) citation.

The final formatting will involve indenting the 2nd and subsequent lines of reference list entries:

Zhao, Qi et al. (2021), "Global, Regional, and National Burden of
Temperatures from 2000 to 2019: A Three-Stage Modelling Study
2021), [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(21\)00081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00081-4).

For this to work will require not putting line breaks in reference list entries.

Thanks and if you run into any questions please let me know.

- Hausfather, Z., K. Marvel, G. A. Schmidt, J. W. Nielsen-Gammon, and M. Zelinka (2022): Climate simulations: Recognize the 'hot model' problem. *Nature*, **605**, 26–29, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-01192-2>.
- Kossin, J et al. (2020) Global increase in major tropical cyclone exceedance probability over the past four decades *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 117 (22) 11975-11980 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1920849117>
- Wehner, M.F., J.R. Arnold, T. Knutson, K.E. Kunkel, and A.N. LeGrande, 2017: Droughts, floods, and wildfires. In: *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment*, Volume I [Wuebbles, D.J., D.W. Fahey, K.A. Hibbard, D.J. Dokken, B.C. Stewart, and T.K. Maycock (eds.)]. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 231-256 doi: 10.7930/J0CJ8BNN.
- Klotzbach, Phil (2025) Real Time Tropical Cyclone Statistics. <https://tropical.atmos.colostate.edu/Realtime/index.php?arch&loc=global>
- Maue, Ryan (2024) Climate Atlas <https://climatlas.com/tropical/>
- Aldrin, M., M. Holden, P. Guttorp, R. B. Skeie, G. Myhre, and T. K. Berntsen, (2012): Bayesian estimation of climate sensitivity based on a simple climate model fitted to observations of hemispheric temperatures and global ocean heat content. *Environmetrics*, 23, 253-271. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/env.2140>
- Allen, M.R. and P.A. Stott (2003) Estimating Signal Amplitudes in Optimal Finger-Printing, Part I: Theory. *Climate Dynamics* 21:477—491. DOI 10.1007/s00382-003-0313-9
- Allen, M.R. and S.F.B. Tett (1999) Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics* 15: 419–434 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003820050291>.
- Arent, D.J., R.S.J. Tol, E. Faust, J.P. Hella, S. Kumar, K.M. Strzepek, F.L. Tóth, and D. Yan (2014) Key economic sectors and services. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L.White (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 659-708. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WGIIAR5-Chap10_FINAL.pdf
- Balcombe, Kevin, Iain Fraser and Abhijit Sharma (2019) Is radiative forcing cointegrated with temperature? A further examination using a structural time series approach." *Management of Environmental Quality* 30(5) DOI 10.1108/MEQ-12-2018-021.
- Bareille, F. and R. Chakir (2023) The impact of climate change on agriculture: A repeat-Ricardian analysis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 119
- Barker, D. (2023) Temperature Shocks and Economic Growth: Comment on Dell, Jones, and Olken. *Econ Journal Watch* 20(2) 234-253 <https://econjwatch.org/articles/temperature-shocks-and-economic-growth-comment-on-dell-jones-and-olken>
- Bates, J.R. (2016) Estimating climate sensitivity using two-zone energy balance models. *Earth and Space Science* 3, 207–225, doi:10.1002/2015EA000154. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/2015EA000154>
- Beenstock, M., Y. Reingewertz and N. Paldor (2012). "Polynomial cointegration tests of anthropogenic impact on global warming." *Earth System Dynamics* 3:173-188 doi:10.5194/esd-3-173-2012
- Bengtsson, Lennart and Stephen E. Schwartz (2013) Determination of a lower bound on Earth's climate sensitivity. *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology* 65(1) <https://b.tellusjournals.se/articles/10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.21533>

- Berg, Kimberly, Chadwick C Curtis and Nelson Mark. (2021) GDP and temperature: Evidence on cross-country response heterogeneity. NBER Working Paper 31327 June 2023 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w31327>
- Brown-Steiner, Benjamin (2024) What Really Does A Climate Model Do, 2024: <https://earthathome.org/de/climate-modeling/what-really-does-a-climate-model-do> Online resource
- Burgess, Matthew et al (2021) Environmental Research Letters 16 014016 <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/abcdd2/meta>
- Burke, Marshall, Solomon M Hsiang, and Edward Miguel (2015). Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature*, 527(7577):235–239.
- Butler, Ethan E., Nathaniel D. Mueller and Peter Huybers (2018) Peculiarly pleasant weather for US maize. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(47) 11935–11940 www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1808035115
- Cannon, Alex (2024) The Impact of ‘Hot Models’ on a CMIP6 Ensemble Used by Climate Service Providers in Canada: Do Global Constraints Lead to Appreciable Differences in Regional Projections? *Journal of Climate* 37(6) pp. 2141–2154 <https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/37/6/ICLI-D-23-0459.1.xml>
- Challinor, Andrew J., et al. A meta-analysis of crop yield under climate change and adaptation. *Nature Climate Change* 4.4 (2014): 287.
- Chand et al. (2022) Declining tropical cyclone frequency under global warming. *Nature* 12 655—661. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41558-022-01388-4>
- Charney, J., Arakawa, A., Baker, D. J., Bolin, B., Dickenson, R. E., Goody, R. M., Leith, C. E., Stommel, H. M., and Wunsch, C. I. (1979) Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A scientific assessment, Tech. rep., National Academy of Sciences, Woods Hole, MA, <https://doi.org/10.17226/12181>, 34 pp., 1979.
- Chen, H, SX Chen and M Mu (2023) A statistical review on the optimal fingerprinting approach in climate change studies. *Climate Dynamics* 62:1439-1446 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-023-06975-5>
- Christy, J.R. and McNider, R.T. (2017). Satellite bulk tropospheric temperatures as a metric for climate sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Science* 53(4) 511-518 DOI:10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z>
- Christy, JR. and R McNider (2017) Satellite Bulk Tropospheric Temperatures as a Metric for Climate Sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences* 53(4) 511—518. DOI:10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z
- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, et al. (2013): Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, et al. (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA
- CO2Science.org (undated) Plant growth archive http://www.co2science.org/data/plant_growth/dry/dry_subject_b.php
- Connolly et al. (2019) Northern Hemisphere Snow-Cover Trends (1967–2018): A Comparison between Climate Models and Observations *Geosciences* 2019, 9(3), 135 <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3263/9/3/135>
- Crisp, David & Dolman, Han (A.J.) & Tanhua, Toste & Mckinley, Galen & Hauck, Judith & Bastos, Ana & Sitch, Stephen & Eggleston, Simon & Aich, Valentin. (2022). How Well Do We Understand the Land-Ocean-Atmosphere Carbon Cycle?. *Reviews of Geophysics*. 60. 10.1029/2021RG000736.
- Davidson, James E.H., David B. Stephenson and Alemtsehai A. Turasie (2015) Time series modeling of paleoclimate data. *Environmetrics* 27(1) pp. 55-65 <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2373>

- Dayaratna, Kevin and Ross McKittrick (2023) "Reply to comment on "climate sensitivity, agricultural productivity and the social cost of carbon in fund" by Philip Meyer" *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 2023 link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10018-023-00364-2
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and Patrick J. Michaels (2020) Climate Sensitivity, Agricultural Productivity and the Social Cost of Carbon in FUND. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00263-w>
- Dayaratna, Kevin, Ross McKittrick and David Kreutzer (2017) Empirically-Constrained Climate Sensitivity and the Social Cost of Carbon. *Climate Change Economics* April 2017 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S2010007817500063>
- Dell, Melissa, Benjamin F. Jones, and Benjamin A. Olken (2012). Temperature shocks and economic growth: Evidence from the last half century. *American economic journal: Macroeconomics*, 4(3):66–95, 2012. ISSN 1945-7707.
- Dergiades, T., R.K. Kaufmann and T. Panagiotidis (2016). Long-run changes in radiative forcing and surface temperature: The effect of human activity over the last five centuries. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 76:67–85. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0095069615000911>
- Deryng, D., Elliott, J., Folberth, C. *et al.* (2021) Regional disparities in the beneficial effects of rising CO₂ concentrations on crop water productivity. *Nature Climate Change* 6, 786–790 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2995>
- Doerr SH and Santin C. (2016) Global trends in wildfire and its impacts: perceptions versus realities in a changing world. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society. B* 371: 20150345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0345>
- Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K. C., Collins, W., Dufresne, J-L., Frame, D., Lunt, D. J., Mauritsen, T., Palmer, M. D., Watanabe, M., Wild, M., and Zhang, H. (2021): The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Masson-Delmotte, V. et al. (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Grandey, Benjamin, Zhi Yang Koh, and Dhruvajyoti Samanta, Benjamin Horton, Justin Dauwels, Lock Chew (2023). Monte Carlo Drift Correction – Quantifying the Drift Uncertainty of Global Climate Models. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10.5194/egusphere-2022-1515.
- Greßer, Christina, Daniel Meierrieks, and David Stadelmann (2021) The link between regional temperature and regional incomes: econometric evidence with sub-national data. *Economic Policy*, 36(107):523–550, 2021.
- Hall, Alex and Syukuro Manabe (1997) The Role of Water Vapor Feedback in Unperturbed Climate Variability and Global Warming. *Journal of Climate* August 1999 Vol 12 pp. 2327–2346.
- Hausfather et al. (2019) "Evaluating the Performance of Past Climate Model Projections" *Geophysical Research Letters* 47(1) <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085378>
- Hausfather, Z. and G. Peters (2020) "Emissions – the 'business as usual' story is misleading" *Nature* 29 January 2020 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-00177-3>
- Hegerl, G.C., F. W. Zwiers, P. Braconnot, N.P. Gillett, Y. Luo, J.A. Marengo Orsini, N. Nicholls, J.E. Penner and P.A. Stott, 2007: Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. In: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Hourdin, F, T Mauritsen, A Gettelman et al. (2017) The Art and Science of Climate Model Tuning. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 98, 589–602, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00135.1>. <https://doi.org/10.1002/env.2835> 2023.

- Hu, Shaowu, Yunxia Wang and Lianxin Yang (2021) Response of rice yield traits to elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and its interaction with cultivar, nitrogen application rate and temperature: A meta-analysis of 20 years FACE studies, *Science of The Total Environment*, 764, 142797, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142797>.
- IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (2013) Chapter 10 online Supplemental Material. Available online at https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/07/WGI_AR5_Chap.10_SM.pdf
- Irving, Damien. (2021). A Mass and Energy Conservation Analysis of Drift in the CMIP6 Ensemble. *Journal of Climate* 34(8) pp. 3157-3170. 10.22541/au.161618917.70147304/v1.
- Johansson D.J.A, Brian C. O'Neill, Claudia Tebaldi and Olle Häggström (2015) Equilibrium climate sensitivity in light of observations over the warming hiatus *Nature Climate Change* DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2573 <https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2573>
- Karl, T. R., S. J. Hassol, C. D. Miller, and W. L. Murray (2006). *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences*. Synthesis and Assessment Product. Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research. <http://www.climate-science.gov/Library/sap/sap1-1/finalreport/sap1-1-final-all.pdf>. Accessed August 3 2010.
- Klotzbach PJ, Pielke Sr RA, Pielke Jr RA, Christy JR, McNider RT. 2009. An alternative explanation for differential temperature trends at the surface and in the lower troposphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **114**: D21102. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2009JD011841>
- Kogan, Feliz, Wei Guob and Wenze Yang (2020) "Near 40-year drought trend during 1981-2019 earth warming and food security" *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk* Vol 11(1)
- Koop, G (2008) *Introduction to Econometrics*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Lee, Sukyoung, Peter R. Bannon, Mingyu Park & Joseph P. Clark (2024) Zonal Contrasts of the Tropical Pacific Climate Predicted by a Global Constraint. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences* Volume 60, pages 669–678 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13143-024-00373-5>
- Lewis, N (2022) Objectively combining climate sensitivity evidence. *Climate Dynamics* 60: 3139—3165 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06468-x>
- Lewis, N. and J.A. Curry, C., (2015). The implications for climate sensitivity of AR5 forcing and heat uptake estimates. *Climate Dynamics*, 10.1007/s00382-014-2342-y. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/2f4994e4ab3a28571ecdff2edb3aeb13/>
- Lewis, N., (2013) An objective Bayesian, improved approach for applying optimal fingerprint techniques to estimate climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*, 26, 7414-7429. <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/abs/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00473.1>
- Lewis, N., and J. Curry, 2018: The impact of recent forcing and ocean heat uptake data on estimates of climate sensitivity. *Journal of Climate*. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D17-0667.1. <https://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0667.1>
- Lewis, N.: Objectively combining climate sensitivity evidence, *Climate Dynamics* 60, 3139-3165, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06468-x>, 2022.
- Lizundia-Loiola, Joshua, Gonzalo Oton, Rubén Ramo and Emilio Chuvieco (2020) A spatio-temporal active-fire clustering approach for global burned area mapping at 250 m from MODIS data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 236 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0034425719305127>
- Loehle, C., (2014). A minimal model for estimating climate sensitivity. *Ecological Modelling*, 276, 80-84 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380014000404>
- Lomborg, Bjorn (2016) "Impact of Current Climate Proposals" *Global Policy* 7(1) 109—118. Available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12295/full>.
- Marlon, Jennifer, Patrick J Bartlein, Daniel G. Gavin et al. (2012) Long-term perspective on wildfires in the western USA *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* February 14 2012 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1112839109>

- Masters, T., 2014: Observational estimate of climate sensitivity from changes in the rate of ocean heat uptake and comparison to CMIP5 models. *Climate Dynamics*, 42,2173-2181 DOI 10.1007/s00382-013-1770-4. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-013-1770-4>
- McKittrick, R (2022a) Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting: a comment. *Climate Dynamics* 58:405-511 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05913-7>
- McKittrick, Ross and Joel Wood (2013) Co-fluctuation patterns of per capita carbon dioxide emissions: The role of energy markets. *Energy Economics* 39 pp. 1-12 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0140988313000649>
- McKittrick, Ross and John R. Christy (2018) A Test of the Tropical 200-300mb Warming Rate in Climate Models. *Earth and Space Science* doi: 10.1029/2018EA000401. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2018EA000401>
- McKittrick, Ross and John R. Christy (2020) Pervasive Warm Bias in CMIP6 Tropospheric Layers. *Earth and Space Science* Vol 7(9) September 2020 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2020EA001281>
- McKittrick, Ross R (2022b) On the choice of TLS versus OLS in climate signal detection regression. *Climate Dynamics* 10.1007/s00382-022-06315-z
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2023) "TLS bias in climate fingerprinting regressions with heterogeneous noise variances and correlated explanatory variables" *Environmetrics*
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Consistent Climate Fingerprinting. *Climate Dynamics* accepted for publication.
- McKittrick, Ross R. (2025) Extended crop yield meta-analysis data do not support upward SCC revision. *Nature Scientific Reports* 15 article 5575 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-90254-2>
- McKittrick, Ross R. and John Christy (2019) Assessing Changes in US Regional Precipitation on Multiple Time Scales *Journal of Hydrology* vol. 578 Nov 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124074>
- McKittrick, Ross R., Mark Strazicich and Junsoo Lee (2012) "Long-Term Forecasting of Global Carbon Dioxide Emissions: Reducing Uncertainties Using a Per-Capita Approach." *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol 32, Issue 5, pp 435-451 DOI: 10.1002/for.2248.
- McSweeney, Robert and Zeke Hausfather (2018) Q&A: How Do Climate Models Work? Online resource <https://www.carbonbrief.org/qa-how-do-climate-models-work/>
- Mendelsohn, R., Morrison, W., Schlesinger, M. E., & Andronova, N. G. (2000). Country-specific market impacts of climate change. *Climatic Change*, 45(3-4), 553-569.
- Mendelsohn, R., Nordhaus, W. D., & Shaw, D. (1994). The impact of global warming on agriculture: a Ricardian analysis. *The American Economic Review*, Sept 1994 753-771.
- Moore FC, Baldos U, Hertel T, Diaz D (2017) New science of climate change impacts on agriculture implies higher social cost of carbon. *Nature Communications* 8:1607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01792-x>
- Moore, Frances C. and Delavane B. Diaz (2015) Temperature impacts on economic growth warrant stringent mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(2):127-131, 2015. ISSN 1758-678X.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Reproducibility and Replicability in Science*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25303>.
- Newell, Richard G., Brian C. Prest, and Steven E. Sexton (2021). The GDP-temperature relationship: Implications for climate change damages. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 108 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102445>
- Nordhaus, William (2006). Geography and macroeconomics: New data and new findings. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(10):3510-3517, 2006. ISSN 0027-8424.
- Nordhaus, William. (2018) Projections and Uncertainties About Climate Change in an Era of Minimal Climate Policies. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* August 2018, 10(3): 333-360. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/pol.20170046>

- Oton, Gonzalo, Joshua Lizundia-Loiola, M. Lucrecia Pettinari and Emilio Chuvieco (2021) Development of a consistent global long-term burned area product (1982–2018) based on AVHRR-LTDR data. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 103(1) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030324342100180X>
- Otto, A, Otto, FEL, Allen, MR, Boucher, O, Church, J, Hegerl, G, Forster, PM, Gillett, NP, Gregory, J, Johnson, GC, Knutti, R, Lohmann, U, Lewis, N, Marotzke, J, Stevens, B, Myhre, G and Shindell, D (2013) Energy budget constraints on climate response. *Nature Geoscience*, 6, 415–416. <https://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo1836>
- Parks, Sean, Christopher Guiterman, Ellis Margolis et al. (2025) A fire deficit persists across diverse North American forests despite recent increases in area burned. *Nature Communications* 16 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-025-56333-8>
- Philipona, R. et al., 2018: Radiosondes Show That After Decades of Cooling, the Lower Stratosphere Is Now Warming. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123(22), 12509–512522, doi:10.1029/2018jd028901. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1029/2018JD028901>
- Pielke, Roger and Ritchie, Justin (2020) "Systemic Misuse of Scenarios in Climate Research and Assessment" Social Sciences Research Network April 2020, available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3581777>
- Pirtle, Zachary, Ryan Meyer and Hamilton, Andrew. (2010). What does it mean when climate models agree? A case for assessing independence among general circulation models. *Environmental Science & Policy - ENVIRON SCI POLICY*. 13. 351-361. 10.1016/j.envsci.2010.04.004.
- Ranasinghe, Roshanka & Ruane, Alex & Vautard, Robert & Arnell, Nigel & Coppola, Erika & Cruz, Faye & Dessai, Suraje & Islam, Akm & Rahimi, Mohammad & Ruiz Carrascal, Daniel & Sillmann, Jana & Sylla, Mouhamadou & Tebaldi, Claudia & Wang, Wen & Rashyd, Zaaboul. (2021). *IPCC Sixth Assessment Report Working Group I Chapter 12: Climate change information for regional impact and for risk assessment*.
- Razzak, Weshah A. (2022). "The Econometrics of Global Warming," *Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, vol. 65(2), pages 13-47.
- Resources for the Future (RFF) (2025). Global Energy Outlook online reference tool <https://www.rff.org/publications/data-tools/global-energy-outlook/> accessed April 18, 2025.
- Ring, M.J., D. Lindner, E.F. Cross and M. E. Schlesinger (2012) Causes of the Global Warming Observed since the 19th Century. *Atmospheric and Climate Sciences*, 2, 401-415. https://file.scirp.org/pdf/ACS20120400002_59142760.pdf
- Ritchie, Hannah Pablo Rosado, and Max Roser (2024) - "CO₂ emissions by fuel" Published online in 2020 at OurWorldinData.org, updated 2024. Retrieved from: 'https://ourworldindata.org/emissions-by-fuel' [Online Resource]
- Roe GH, Baker MB (2007) Why is climate sensitivity so unpredictable? *Science* 318:629–632
- Rutgers University Snow Lab (undated) <http://climate.rutgers.edu/snowcover/index.php>
- Scaffeta, N (2023) CMIP6 GCM ensemble members versus global surface temperatures. *Climate Dynamics* 60, 3091–3120 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06493-w>
- Schelling, Thomas C (1992) Some economics of global warming. *The American Economic Review*, 82 (1):1–14.
- Schwartz, Stephen E., Robert J. Charlson and Henning Rodhe (2007) Quantifying climate change — too rosy a picture? *Nature Reports-Climate Change* Vol 2 pp. 23-24.
- Seager, R., Cane, M., Henderson, N., Lee, D. E., Abernathey, R., and Zhang, H. (2019): Strengthening tropical Pacific zonal sea surface temperature gradient consistent with rising greenhouse gases, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 9, 517-522, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0505-x>, 2019
- Sen Gupta, Alexander & Jourdain, Nicolas & Brown, Jaclyn & Monselesan, Didier. (2013). Climate drift in the CMIP5 models. *Journal of Climate*. 26. 8597-8615. 10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00521.1.

- Shaviv, Nir J., Henrik Svensmark and Jan Veizer (2023) *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1519:7—19. <https://nyaspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1111/nyas.14920>
- Sherwood, S. C., and Forest, C. E.: (2024) Opinion: Can uncertainty in climate sensitivity be narrowed further?, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 24, 2679-2686, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-2679-2024>.
- Sherwood, S. C., Webb, M. J., Annan, J. D., Armour, K. C., Forster, P. M., Hargreaves, J. C., Hegerl, G., Klein, S. A., Marvel, K. D., Rohling, E. J., Watanabe, M., Andrews, T., Braconnot, P., Bretherton, C. S., Foster, G. L., Hausfather, Z., Heydt, A. S., Knutti, R., Mauritsen, T., Norris, J. R., Proistosescu, C., Rugenstein, M., Schmidt, G. A., Tokarska, K. B., and Zelinka, M. D. (2020) An Assessment of Earth's Climate Sensitivity Using Multiple Lines of Evidence, *Review of Geophysics*, 58, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000678>.
- Simpson, I et al. (2024) Observed humidity trends in dry regions contradict climate models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2024 Vol. 121 No. 1 e2302480120 <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2302480120>
- Skeie, R.B., T. Berntsen, M. Aldrin, M. Holden, and G. Myhre. A lower and more constrained estimate of climate sensitivity using updated observations and detailed radiative forcing time series (2014) *Earth System Dynamics* 5, 139–175, 2014 doi:10.5194/esd-5-139-2014. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/05f113e95581027c9a9f0f0a2a1551ac/>
- Spencer, Roy (2024) Global Warming: Observations vs. Climate Models. Heritage Foundation January 2024 <https://www.heritage.org/environment/report/global-warming-observations-vs-climate-models>
- Spencer, Roy W. and John R. Christy (2024) Effective climate sensitivity distributions from a 1D model of global ocean and land temperature trends, 1970–2021 *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* 155 pp. 299-308. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00704-023-04634-7>
- Stansfield et al. (2020) “Changes in Precipitation From North Atlantic Tropical Cyclones Under RCP Scenarios in the Variable-Resolution Community Atmosphere Model” *Geophys. Res. Letters* <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1029/2019GL086930>
- Stern, D and R. Kaufmann (2000) “Detecting a global warming signal in hemispheric temperature series: A structural time series analysis.” *Climatic Change* 47:411-438.
- Storm, S (2017) “How the Invisible Hand is Supposed to Adjust the Natural Thermostat: A Guide for the Perplexed.” *Science and Engineering Ethics* vol 23: 1307—1331.
- Taylor, Charles and Wolfram Schlenker (2023) Environmental drivers of agricultural productivity growth: CO2 fertilization of US field crops. National Bureau of Economic Research Working paper 29320, <http://www.nber.org/paper/w29320>
- Tol, Richard (2002) “Estimates of the Damage Costs of Climate Change” *Environmental and Resource Economics* 21:47—73
- US Environmental Protection Agency (2023) Supplementary Material for the Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Rulemaking, “Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review”, EPA Report on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases: Estimates Incorporating Recent Scientific Advances, November 2023, https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-12/epa_scghg_2023_report_final.pdf
- Vogelsang, T and N. Nawaz (2016) “Estimation and Inference of Linear Trend Slope Ratios With an Application to Global Temperature Data.” *Journal of Time Series Analysis* doi.org/10.1111/jtsa.12209 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jtsa.12209>
- Wigley, T.M.L. (1998). “The Kyoto Protocol: CO2, CH4 and climate implications.” *Geophysical Research Letters* 25(13), 2285-2288
- Yang, Yimin, Fei Jia, and Haoran Li. Estimation of panel data models with mixed sampling frequencies (2023). *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3):514–544.


Zhao, Xiaobing, Mason Gerety, and Nicolai V. Kuminoff (2018) Revisiting the temperature-economic growth relationship using global subnational data. *Journal of environmental management*, 223:537–544, 2018.

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Ross McKittrick; Steve Koonin; Roy Spencer; Judith Curry; Travis Fisher; Josh Loucks
Subject: WWA zinger?

All

I've been thinking about how to make it clear in a simple way that WWA attribution methods are pseudoscience. Attached is the figure from Mass et al. 2024 depicting the 2021 hot event that we describe in our text. WWA folks looked at the Pacific NW and found attribution. However, they avoided trying to explain the opposite anomaly in northern Argentina where record cold occurred and snow fell in southern Brazil. Since an hypothesis (humans cause all anomalies) must explain all evidence, where is the explanation from WWA for the Argentina cold at the same time as the PacNW heat?

John C.



From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 6:48 PM
To: Judith Curry; Roy W. Spencer; John Christy; Steven Koonin; Travis Fisher; Josh Loucks
Subject: JUne 11 draft
Attachments: NCA5.Review.[RM].June11.docx

The attached incorporates all of Judy's suggestions including deletions and John's edits of Sct 4.2. I also dealt with Steve's various comments in the opening section as best I could. Did some additional editing, including adding in Roy's word search data. John you had suggested some additional text for the NCA4 magic ratio diagram but I think the example works best if we keep the writeup as simple as possible.

I am not sure Chapter 7 (biased references) is needed unless someone plans to write it up. I moved the discussion of the NASEM review to Ch 8. Do we have more material for that? Also I took out the review example from RPJr since I don't think we have documentation for it. it is a good one to keep in reserve though in case people want to wave peer review at us.

Review of the Fifth National Climate Assessment

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	ABOUT THIS REPORT	2
1.2	ABOUT THE NATIONAL CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS	2
1.3	STANDARDS FOR ASSESSING NCA PRODUCTS	3
1.4	WHEN PEER-REVIEW FAILS	5
2	NCA5 OVERVIEW CHAPTER: HYPERBOLIC ADVOCACY LANGUAGE AND NON-SCIENTIFIC TONE	9
3	OVERCONFIDENCE WHEN STATING CONCLUSIONS	11
3.1	INFLATED CERTAINTY LEVELS	11
3.2	OVERSTATING FINDINGS IN UNDERLYING SOURCES	12
4	RELiance ON <i>AD HOC</i> TIME SCALES FOR TREND ANALYSIS	15
4.1	AVERAGE AND EXTREME PRECIPITATION	15
4.2	HEATWAVES	16
5	INADEQUATE TRACEABLE ACCOUNTS	19
6	OVEREMPHASIS ON EXTREME SCENARIOS	21
7	BIASED SELECTION OF REFERENCES	22
8	SUMMARY: EVALUATION OF THE NCA5	23
8.1	INADEQUATE NASEM REVIEW	23
8.2	PERTINENT ASPECTS WHEN EVALUATING NCA5 IN LIGHT OF STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	24
8.3	EVALUATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EXPERT USERS OF THE REPORT	24
8.4	EVALUATION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF CITIZENS INTERESTED IN GOOD POLICYMAKING	24
	APPENDIXES	25

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 About this Report

This report responds to a request from OSTP Director Michael Kratsios (reproduced in Appendix XX) that we assess the suitability of the Fifth National Climate Assessment for informing climate and energy policies.

To conduct this assessment we reviewed NCA5 itself, NASEM review of the Third Order Draft and the USGCRP responses to the review. We have drawn upon our long experience working on advisory reports, including for the NASEM, IPCC and other organizations, as writers, reviewers and project leaders.

Our report begins with background on the National Climate Assessments. We then discuss the standards by which we have assessed NCA5, followed by specific deficiencies that we have identified

We find that NCA5 should not be relied on for policy making as it is an incomplete and misleading picture of our understanding of the changing climate and the risks it poses to the nation. NCA5 was selective and incomplete in its survey of the science as of its publication date in 2023 and has become even more so in the years since. We have reviewed many key scientific developments in a separate report to Energy Secretary Wright (Climate Working Group 2025, herein denoted “CWG25”). The overall effect of the biases and omissions of NCA5 is an excessively dire picture of climate risk.

1.2 About the National Climate Assessments

The U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) was established by Presidential Initiative in 1989 and mandated by Congress in the Global Change Research Act (GCRA) of 1990 to develop and coordinate “a comprehensive and integrated United States research program which will assist the Nation and the world to understand, assess, predict, and respond to human-induced and natural processes of global change.”

The National Climate Assessment (NCA) Reports evolved from the GCRA requirement to

Prepare and submit to the President and the Congress an assessment which (1) integrates, evaluates, and interprets the findings of the Program and discusses the scientific uncertainties associated with such findings; (2) analyzes the effects of global change on the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, human health and welfare, human social systems, and biological diversity; and (3) analyzes current trends in global change, both human-induced and natural, and projects major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years.

The five NCA Reports to date have interpreted this mandate in different ways:

- NCA1 (2000) was a multidisciplinary effort to study and portray in regional detail the potential effects of human-induced global warming on the United States.
- NCA2 (2009) was a relatively short report that not only focused on the potential consequences of climate change, but also sought to identify potential adaptation measures and identify the highest priorities for future research.
- NCA3 (2014) was an expanded effort that continued along the lines of NCA2, and was distinguished by a comprehensive review process, including a review by the National

Academy of Sciences. NCA3 introduced a traceability analysis for each key finding, including a description of uncertainties.

- NCA4 (2017/2018) was an expanded effort published in two volumes: I Climate Science Special Report, and II Impacts, Risk, and Adaptation in the United States. This was the first NCA report to devote significant effort to assessing climate science.
- NCA5 (2023) returned to a single volume format, reducing discussion of climate science to a cursory two chapters, with continuing with a focus on regional and sectoral impacts of climate change. NCA5 expanded its remit to topics that are arguably outside the purview of the USGCRP, focusing on “Climate Action” and policy recommendations with a social justice emphasis. NCA5’s self-description is reproduced as Appendix II.

These successive interpretations of the NCA are poorly aligned with the GCRA’s statutory requirements. Only NCA4 gives serious consideration to climate science, which receives the great majority of USGCRP funding, and even then misrepresents some important points. Natural climate variability is essentially dismissed as unimportant in NCA4 and barely mentioned in NCA5 in most contexts, despite the mandate to include both human-caused and natural climate change. Most significantly, NCA5 has redirected the focus away from climate science and even the hazard elements of impacts, towards evaluation of societal vulnerabilities and advocacy for particular policy options, especially wind and solar power. The cover image for the NCA5 Report is the installation of a solar panel.

1.3 Standards for Assessing NCA Products

In Appendix XX we include a letter of guidance from the Office of General Counsel, U.S. Department of Energy, summarizing the extent of statutory requirements governing USGCRP work products in general and NCA products in particular.

We can summarize the standards applicable to the NCA as follows:

- details.

Beyond the statutory requirements we draw attention to two other pertinent standards. President Trump’s executive order of May 23, 2025, “Restoring Gold Standard Science” enumerates some of the characteristics of good science:

- i. reproducible;
- ii. transparent;
- iii. communicative of error and uncertainty;
- iv. collaborative and interdisciplinary;
- v. skeptical of its findings and assumptions;
- vi. structured for falsifiability of hypotheses;
- vii. subject to unbiased peer review;
- viii. accepting of negative results as positive outcomes; and
- ix. without conflicts of interest.

Although these should be self-evident to those trained in science, it is surprising that some have found them controversial.

When scientific reports are being assembled that will be highly influential on climate policymaking there are other desiderata, including statements about the strength of climate knowledge. The IPCC's approach is based on judgment of the available evidence and agreement among experts. More sophisticated knowledge characterizations for risk management include (Aven 2017)¹:

- The degree to which the assumptions made are reasonable/realistic based on background knowledge
- The degree to which data/information exists and are reliable and relevant
- The degree to which there is disagreement among experts (including those from different environments or academic fields)
- The degree to which the phenomena involved are understood and accurate models exist
- The degree to which the knowledge has been thoroughly examined with respect to unknown knowns

Good climate and energy policies will balance the risks and benefits of a changing climate against the world's growing demand for reliable and affordable energy. To strike that balance, policymakers must understand at least two complex and nuanced topics: the certainties and uncertainties of climate science and the technoeconomic realities of energy systems. Experts in those subjects have a unique responsibility to communicate their understanding to non-experts clearly, completely, and without bias.

Expertise in energy systems resides largely in the private sector, where it is essential to providing the reliable and affordable energy services that are the lifeblood of society. Understanding is therefore continually refined and tested by the discipline of the marketplace. In contrast, climate science expertise is found largely in the non-profit realm of universities and government laboratories and so has a more academic character.

In recent decades, climate science has engendered passion and emotion. Indeed, some younger climate scientists have gone into the field to "save the planet." So it is not surprising that objectivity can suffer when climate scientists communicate their understanding to non-experts. Further, the field of climate science has been politicized by NetZero mandates. This lack of objectivity usurps the public's right to make informed choices and undermines their confidence in the scientific enterprise.

Philip Handler, President of the National Academy of Sciences, identified the problem in a 1980 editorial² that resonates eerily four decades later:

Difficulty arises in the scientific community from confusion of the role of scientist *qua* scientist with that of scientist as citizen, confusion of the ethical code of the scientist with the obligation of the citizen, blurring the distinction between intrinsically scientific and intrinsically political questions. When scientists fail to recognize these boundaries, their own ideological beliefs, usually unspoken, easily becloud seemingly scientific debate.

¹ Aven, Terje (2017) "Improving Risk Characterisations in Practical Situations by Highlighting Knowledge Aspects, with Applications to Risk Matrices," *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 167 (November 2017): 42–48 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0951832016306950>

² Handler, Philip (1980) Public Doubts About Science. *Science* 208(4448) p. 1093 <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.208.4448.1093>

1.4 When Peer-Review Fails

Peer-review of reports like IPCC and NCA products is not a silver bullet that guarantees quality. The peer review process for these reports differs in some important respects from traditional peer review in academic journals. First, NCA reviewers self-select on a volunteer basis whether to provide comments and what parts of the report to read, whereas in academic journals Editors recruit reviewers and assign them to specific papers. There is no guarantee that any particular section of an NCA report was reviewed by anyone, let alone by someone with a different perspective than the authors. This is a problem with NCA and IPCC reports since over the years many potential reviewers have given up making the effort, because their input has systematically been ignored. Second, NCA authors have near complete authority whether to accept or reject review comments. Here, for example, is how a review comment critical of a section of the NCA5 draft was handled by the authors:

By contrast in academic journals the Editor mandates the author to respond and the reviewer gets to assess its adequacy. Once an NCA chapter author team has been selected publication of their work is guaranteed, whereas academic journals routinely reject papers if they do not pass review.

These points are important to bear in mind because some readers might dismiss any criticism of NCA products out of hand on the grounds that they were “peer reviewed”. But the test of a report is whether its contents are a valid representation of the available evidence. Here we give an example in which NCA4 gave prominence to a Figure that completely misrepresented the underlying data and which evaded peer review to do so. Further details can be found in Koonin (2024).

As we pointed out in CWG25 Section 6.3 the number of heat extremes in the U.S. peaked in the 1930s and has declined ever since. Considering cold and hot extremes together the U.S. the U.S. climate has become more moderate over time. NCA4’s Part I (Climate Science Special Report, CCSR) says (prominently and with *Very High Confidence*) on Page 19 of the Executive Summary:

There have been marked changes in temperature extremes across the contiguous United States. The number of high temperature records set in the past two decades far exceeds the number of low temperature records.

and offers this figure in support:

Record Warm Daily Temperatures Are Occurring More Often





Figure ES.5: Observed changes in the occurrence of record-setting daily temperatures in the contiguous United States. Red bars indicate a year with more daily record highs than daily record lows, while blue bars indicate a year with more record lows than highs. The height of the bar indicates the ratio of record highs to lows (red) or of record lows to highs (blue). For example, a ratio of 2:1 for a blue bar means that there were twice as many record daily lows as daily record highs that year. (Figure source: NOAA/NCEI). From Figure 6.5 in Chapter 6.

The Figure appears to validate the claim that record warm daily temperatures are occurring more often. But the underlying data do not: they show that extreme heat in the U.S. peaked in the 1920s and 1930s and declined thereafter, as NCA4 Figure 6.4 later shows. Figure ES.5 does not show what its title implies: these are not simple counts of cold and warm extreme events; instead they are ratios of the two. In fact both types of extremes declined over the sample interval, but cold events declined more than warm events, so the ratio of warm extremes to cold extremes increased. By graphing the ratio in this way the NCA4 created a visual impression opposite to what is in the data.

Figure 6.3.3 of CWG25 (reproduced below) shows the results of a proper analysis of the data – defining each record as the singular extreme in the history, displaying numbers of warm and cold records separately, and beginning the analysis in 1899 rather than 1930. It makes evident the exceptional heat of the 1920s and especially the 1930s, peaking in 1936. The increased heat of the past five years is too brief to be deemed climatically significant and, in any event, occurred after the CSSR was published in 2017. The frequency of cold records has declined, especially over the last quarter of the period in which only 13 percent of the extreme cold events were measured. In contrast, 25 percent of the extreme Tmax records were achieved in the last quarter, which is consistent with statistical expectations. As a result, the ratio of heat to cold extremes shown in Figure ES.5 of the CSSR explodes in recent decades. The overall reduction in numbers of both cold and hot extremes over the past century indicates a climate *less* prone to extremes, in sharp contrast to the message of the NCA4 Figure ES.5.



Number of daily record High (red) and Low (blue) temperatures for warm and cold seasons in the CONUS. The lines represent the 15-year running, centered average. Source: 1,211 USHCN stations supplemented as needed to achieve a minimum of 92 percent of observations in the 126-year period since Dec 1898. US48: contiguous U.S. states. Tmax: maximum temperature. Tmin: minimum temperature. Source: CWG25 Figure 6.3.3.

The National Academies' expert review panel criticized the discussion of temperature extremes in a late draft of the CSSR. In reference to the CSSR's Key Finding 2 of Chapter 6, they said:

Further, it is difficult to understand how a statement that includes increases in extreme warmth can be associated with a high confidence or extremely likely statement, given that most of the graphics in this chapter show a decrease in extreme warmth in the historical record.

The Federal official in charge of the CSSR (Michael Kuperberg, Executive Director of the USGCRP) responded to the Academies' review by noting that

Almost every recommendation from the NAS was incorporated [in the final version]... and a new figure was added on changes in record high and low temperatures

The "new figure" referred to is the Figure ES.5, which did not appear in the draft reviewed by the Academies' panel. It seems unlikely that the Academies panel ever saw that figure because they surely would have commented if they had and it wouldn't have survived to publication. And the figure's problems were evidently not flagged (or were ignored) in the subsequent internal government reviews.

With this background we now present our critique of NCA5.

2 NCA5 OVERVIEW CHAPTER: HYPERBOLIC ADVOCACY LANGUAGE AND NON-SCIENTIFIC TONE

NCA5 Chapter 1 “Overview” holds a prominent place in the Report since it summarizes the whole report and is the only section that many will read. Although the later Chapters of NCA5 contain much sound scholarly content, Chapter 1 is marred by a pervasive tone and language that aggressively promotes emission reduction policies. As such, this chapter adds an imprimatur of scientific authority to oversimplified declarations of opinion about public policy. Here we cite a few examples that are particularly egregious.

Chapter 1 opens as follows:

The more the planet warms, the greater the impacts. Without rapid and deep reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions from human activities, the risks of accelerating sea level rise, intensifying extreme weather, and other harmful climate impacts will continue to grow. Each additional increment of warming is expected to lead to more damage and greater economic losses compared to previous increments of warming, while the risk of catastrophic or unforeseen consequences also increases.

This statement presupposes that: all warming is anthropogenic in origin, all warming is bad and causes economic damage, warming causes extreme weather to intensify. Such sweeping generalizations go well beyond what science has or can establish. It also refers to growing risks without saying whether they were large to begin with: a small risk that grows may still be a small risk. A scientifically-sound version of this paragraph would instead say something like the following:

The Earth is warming because of a combination of natural and anthropogenic influences. This warming will generate a mix of benefits and harms that varies by region, to which society should be prepared to adapt. Some types of extreme weather have worsened recently, while others have not changed or have even declined in intensity. Reducing emissions of greenhouse gases might slow the warming although such policies have proven to be costly and disruptive, so any climate actions to be weighed against the potential benefits.

On the next page the Overview goes on to say:

Each additional increment of warming leads to greater risks [here it lists 7 key components of society including food security and the economy]... Without deeper cuts in global net emissions, climate risks to the US will continue to grow... Action to limit future warming and reduce risks can have near-term benefits and opportunities: low-carbon energy jobs, Improved air quality, Health benefits, Economic benefits...”

The authors write as if climate policy does not involve trade-offs and all measures to reduce future warming will be effective and beneficial. But the vast body of scholarship on climate science and economics does not support such simplistic claims. Not every additional increment of warming leads to economic harms, indeed (as is acknowledged in Chapter 19 on Economics) in some cases there will be benefits. Nor is climate policy guaranteed to create jobs or benefit the economy; in many cases it has done the opposite. Such deceit is a disservice to policymakers.

Pages 8 and 9 promote renewable energy options by noting, correctly, that the levelized costs of wind/solar generation have fallen sharply since 2010. This is proposed as rationale for pursuing deep emission reductions:

Recent growth in the capacities of wind, solar, and battery storage technologies is supported by rapidly falling costs of zero- and low-carbon energy technologies, which can support even deeper emissions reductions. For example, wind and solar energy costs dropped 70% and 90%, respectively, over the last decade, while 80% of new generation capacity in 2020 came from renewable sources.

Yet it has long been known that intermittent renewables generation must be supplemented by dispatchable generation to meet grid reliability standards, and that doing so (e.g., through natural gas, fission, or storage) can substantially increase the cost of electricity. Further, there are yet unmet synchronization challenges in transmission grids with heavy penetration of wind and solar power. Here again it is advisory malpractice not to acknowledge these facts.

Page 14 presents future emission scenarios with the following description: “Climate modeling experts develop global climate projections for a range of plausible futures.” The word “plausible” is applied to all the scenarios. The accompanying Figure includes both SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5, the latter reaching the same radiative forcing as RCP8.5. The figure does not contrast observed emissions against previous projections nor does it caution readers that SSP3-7.0 and SSP5-8.5 are extreme worst case scenarios that, like RCP8.5, have been heavily criticized in the scientific literature (CWG25 3.2.1). By describing the entire envelope of emission projections as “plausible” the report opens the door to later presenting impacts associated with extreme and implausible emission scenarios as part of a baseline “business-as-usual” future.

Page 17 introduces the discussion of risks from extreme weather events by saying “Harmful impacts from more frequent and severe extremes are increasing across the country.” This creates the impression that disaster losses are driven by trends in extreme weather. While the section goes on to acknowledge that some of the increase is due to increases in the value of assets at risk it then invokes the NOAA Billion Dollar Dataset as evidence of extreme weather getting worse. Scientists have shown that this is an invalid metric (CWG 10.2) since it measures the growth of the economy not the frequency of extreme weather, and indeed NOAA has recently withdrawn the data product. Even though it was still distributed by NOAA at the time of the NCA5, the report authors should have assessed it skeptically and seen that it was unfit for the purpose of measuring climate trends and they should have taken care not to conflate extreme weather metrics with economic trends.

Page 23 states, in large font:

Climate changes are making it harder to maintain safe homes and healthy families; reliable public services; a sustainable economy; thriving ecosystems, cultures, and traditions; and strong communities.

It is pointless to try to evaluate this statement on scholarly grounds; it is self-evidently hyperbolic. This kind of language doesn’t belong in a scientific assessment report. Its prominent inclusion points not only to the willingness of NCA5 authors to promote hysteria, but also the ineffectiveness of the review process at not ensuring such statements are removed.

The tone of the Overview chapter hints at the priorities that governed the writing of the report as a whole. As a crude indicator of these priorities, word searches of the full document revealed the following occurrences:

Term	Number of occurrences
Forcing	111
Uncertainty	384
Watts	19
Culture/culturally	854
Equity/equitable	572
Indigenous	890
Sustainable	295
Racism/racial	153

3 OVERCONFIDENCE WHEN STATING CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Inflated certainty levels

A general pattern in the NCA5 is overconfidence in stating conclusions. The authors frequently make sweeping generalizations without appropriate caveats or acknowledging uncertainties. The overconfidence begins with inflated language to describe certainty levels.

The NCA5 uses specific terms to convey information about scientific confidence associated with important finds, observations and projections. The Front Matter of the NCA5 states that “confidence in a finding is based on the type, amount, quality, strength, and consistency of evidence; the skill, range, and consistency of methods to detect, evaluate, attribute, and interpret climate trends; and the degree of agreement across scientific information sources.”

Table 1 from the Front Matter provides calibrated language for confidence assessment:

Very high:	Strong evidence (established theory, multiple sources, well documented and accepted methods, etc.). High consensus
High:	Moderate evidence (several sources, some consistency, methods vary and/or documentation limited, etc.). Medium consensus
Medium:	Suggestive evidence (a few sources, limited consistency, methods emerging, etc.) Competing schools of thought.
Low:	Inconclusive evidence (limited sources, extrapolations, inconsistent findings, poor documentation and/or methods not tested, etc.). Disagreement or lack of opinions among experts.

This terminology is inflated: *high confidence* with just moderate evidence and medium consensus; *medium confidence* with only suggestive evidence and competing schools of thought. This inflation in terminology leads to overconfidence in the conclusions.

Even within the context of this inflated terminology, NCA5 further inflates the confidence level of many of its conclusions to well beyond what the IPCC has concluded with more thorough justification, and also by incorrectly applying its own standards. Several illustrative examples are provided.

Key Message 3.1 Traceable Account states: “There is *very high confidence* that emissions of GHGs from human activities, fossil fuel use in particular, have unequivocally caused *all* global warming observed over the industrial era.” Compare this statement with statements from the IPCC AR5 and AR6:

AR5: “It is *extremely likely* that *more than half* of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in greenhouse gas concentrations and other anthropogenic forcings together.” (IPCC, 2013)

AR6: “The *likely* range of total human-caused global surface temperature increase from 1850–1900 to 2010–2019 is 0.8°C to 1.3°C, with a best estimate of 1.07°C. It is *likely* that well-mixed GHGs contributed a warming of 1.0°C to 2.0°C, other human drivers (principally aerosols) contributed a cooling of 0.0°C to 0.8°C, natural drivers changed global surface temperature by –0.1°C to +0.1°C, and internal variability changed it by –0.2°C to +0.2°C. It is *very likely* that well-mixed GHGs were the main driver of tropospheric warming since 1979.” (IPCC, 2021)

The IPCC AR5 and AR6 statements provide likelihood assessments but not a confidence level. While the NCA5 claims with *very high confidence* that fossil fuels have unequivocally caused *all* global warming, the AR5 refers to “*more than half* of the observed warming” and the AR6 provides a more nuanced statement that relates to a *likely* range of warming contributed to by human drivers.

NCA5 Key message 2.2: “Hurricanes have been intensifying more rapidly since the 1980s (*high confidence*) and causing heavier rainfall and higher storm surges (*high confidence*).” No justification is provided in Chapter 2 for the *high confidence* conclusion on higher storm surges or hurricanes causing heavier precipitation. The Traceable Accounts section, Description of Confidence and Likelihood states: “Basic physical understanding and climate models both provide robust explanations for the links between climate change and observed changes in these extremes: this is why the authors also have *high confidence* that storms are delivering more rainfall and high confidence that storm surges are becoming higher.” In short, the NCA5 provides no observational basis or published research for their *high confidence* assertions that hurricanes are causing heavier rainfall and higher storm surges; and does not meet its own standards for a *high confidence level*.

3.2 Overstating findings in underlying sources

Although we did not do a detailed audit of the NCA5’s use of source material, spot checks turned up evidence of a pattern of overstatement.

Chapter 2 page 11 reports on an increase in precipitation in some areas and attributes it to climate change:

Many eastern regions of the country are getting wetter (Figure 2.4). Average annual precipitation from 2002-2021 was 5%-15% higher relative to the 1901-1960 average in the central and eastern US, a trend attributable to climate change.

Note that this a non-standard metric; we will discuss NCA5's inconsistent choices of time scales of analysis below. The claims were attributed to the following paper:

- Knutson, Thomas and Fanrong Zeng (2018) "Model Assessment of Observed Precipitation Trends over Land Regions: Detectable Human Influences and Possible Low Bias in Model Trends" *Journal of Climate* 31(12)
<https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/clim/31/12/jcli-d-17-0672.1.xml>

But Knutson and Zeng did not say these things. They examined linear trends over 1901 – 2010, 1951 – 2010 and 1981 – 2010. They did not compare average rainfall over 2002 - 2021 to average rainfall over 1901 – 1960, indeed their study was published in 2018 so it could not have. With regard to 1981-2010 trends they noted stronger trends in some areas but cautioned that such changes are consistent with natural variability, and they did not claim attributable trends were observed over the United States:

Observed annual precipitation trends over the recent 30-yr period 1981–2010 (Fig. 5) have generally stronger magnitudes (in mm yr⁻¹ decade⁻¹) than observed trends for 1901–2010 or 1951–2010. This is as expected since trends over a shorter period have stronger potential for occurrence of pronounced temporary trends due to internal variability alone. Only 9% of the analyzed area has detectable and attributable anthropogenic influence (categories –3, –2, +2, +3), which represents less than one-third of the fractional areal coverage of such trends for 1901–2010 (29%). ... Eight percent of the analyzed area has attributable anthropogenic *increases* (categories +2, +3), including parts of eastern Europe, northern Asia, northern Australia/Maritime Continent, and tropical Africa.

Consider a 2nd example. NCA5 Chapter 2 page 18 states

There is robust evidence that human-caused warming has contributed to increases in the frequency and severity of the heaviest precipitation events across nearly 70% of the US.

This is attributed to two papers:

- Diffenbaugh, N.S., D. Singh, and J.S. Mankin, 2018: Unprecedented climate events: Historical changes, aspirational targets, and national commitments. *Science Advances*, **4** (2), 3354. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao3354>
- Kirchmeier-Young, M.C. and X. Zhang, 2020: Human influence has intensified extreme precipitation in North America. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **117** (24), 13308-13313. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1921628117>

Diffenbaugh et al. presented ratios of observed occurrences of extreme events to simulated occurrence rates in CMIP6 models run with only natural forcings. They report that for 79% of the U.S. extreme rainfall event frequencies are currently higher than in model simulations, and the ratio of occurrences will rise under future warming simulations. This is not "robust" evidence of anthropogenic influence since it requires readers to assume that climate models provide accurate

simulations of regional precipitation patterns, something which even the IPCC AR6 admits is uncertain (AR6 WGI SPM Box SPM 1.2, SPM Section C.1.3).

Kirchmeier-Young and Zhang looked at extreme 1- and 5-day events in North America and, using 3 GCMs, found “A signal of combined anthropogenic and natural external forcing can be detected in the intensification of extreme precipitation at the continental scale over North America. In some cases, this intensification can be attributed to human influence specifically.” However, they noted large differences among the three models in their simulated precipitation changes. Also, 2 of the 3 models failed to yield detection for 5-day events for the North America mean. Both cited references utilized the implausible RCP8.5 scenario and began their “historical” observational records only in 1961. Here again this is not “robust” evidence, it is suggestive but other studies have found natural variability predominant.

4 RELIANCE ON *Ad Hoc* TIME SCALES FOR TREND ANALYSIS

In CWG25 Chapter 6 we discussed the need to be careful regarding the choice of time scale when making claims about trends in extreme weather. We gave examples from analysis of river flooding (6.1), heatwaves (6.3) and extreme precipitation (6.4) to show how assertions about apparent trends based on short data sets fall apart when looking at longer versions of the same data sets. Here we elaborate on these examples to illustrate a general point that NCA5 made inconsistent and *ad hoc* choices about time scales of analysis, weakening the validity of their conclusions.

McKittrick and Christy (2019)³ showed that apparently significant positive trends in U.S. average and extreme precipitation over the NCA4 interval (1901 – 2016) disappeared on longer samples (extending back as far as the 1840s depending on location) or on a shorter interval coinciding with the final 40 years of the data then available (1978 – 2017).

In CWG Section 6.4 we presented analysis of updated data for the same locations and many more besides, in all cases finding considerable regional heterogeneity and lack of robustness of trends to use of long samples.

4.1 Average and Extreme Precipitation

Under Key Message 2.2 “Extreme Events Are Becoming More Frequent and Severe” (p. 2-16) NCA5 states (p. 2-18):

Rainfall is becoming more extreme

Since the 1950s, there has been an upward trend in heavy precipitation across the contiguous US. This increase is driven largely by more frequent precipitation extremes, with relatively smaller changes in their intensity.

NCA5 did not continue the NCA4 precedent of using the post-1901 interval as the time scale for its precipitation discussion, instead it refers to changes “since the 1950s”. Fig. 2.8 suggests 1958 as the start date. For the present report we have extended the CWG25 analysis even further to include 141 stations across the US in the Pacific Coast, Midwest, Northeast and Southeast regions. We provide details in the Appendix; here we note merely that once again it is possible to find trends that support the NCA5 position, but they are not robust to selecting longer or shorter time scales of analysis. Data from 1950 to 2024 yields many indications of increased average and extreme precipitation at individual stations and region-wide averages. But when using the entire data set (back to the 1890s or earlier depending on location) or the later subset (1980 to 2024) the trends become smaller, in many cases they become statistically insignificant, and occasionally they change sign. Only in the Northeast region are the post-1950 trends robust to also focusing on the post-1980 interval.

The following is a more accurate summary of what U.S. data show.

³ McKittrick, R., and J.R. Christy (2019). Assessing changes in US regional precipitation on multiple time scales. *Journal of Hydrology*, 578, 124074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.124074>


There are regionally-heterogenous changes in average and extreme precipitation. Positive trends in annual average rainfall and extreme events (defined either as the annual maximum or the number of exceedances of the 99th percentile value) are generally weak or non-existent when looking at samples exceeding 130 years in length. Significant trends can be found when beginning the sample in the 1950s although in most cases the trends weaken and become insignificant when looking at the post-1980 interval. This makes attribution to anthropogenic warming difficult.

4.2 Heatwaves

In contrast to NCA5, NCA4 examined heat extremes across the whole of the 20th century, pointing out that peak heat wave activity was reached in the 1930s and has decreased since then, and that recent increases are confined to areas west of the Rockies:


[The] warmest daily temperature of the year increased in some parts of the West over the past century, but there were decreases in almost all locations east of the Rocky Mountains. In fact, all eastern regions experienced a net decrease, most notably the Midwest (about 2.2°F [1.2°C]) and the Southeast (roughly 1.5°F [0.8°C]).

Since the mid-1960s, there has been only a very slight increase in the warmest daily temperature of the year (amidst large interannual variability). Heat waves (6-day periods with a maximum temperature above the 90th percentile for 1961–1990) increased in frequency until the mid-1930s, became considerably less common through the mid-1960s, and increased in frequency again thereafter. As with warm daily temperatures, heat wave magnitude reached a maximum in the 1930s. (NCA4 pp. 190-191)



U.S. Heat waves since 1900. Source: NCA4 Figure 6.4

Contrast this careful and factual language with NCA5 Key Message 2.2: “Extreme Events Are Becoming More frequent and Severe.” This blanket statement is followed by NCA5 Figure 2.7 reproduced below.



Hot days have increased in the West, hot nights have increased nearly everywhere, and cold days have decreased.

Figure 2.7. Over much of the country, the risk of warm nights has increased while the risk of cold days has decreased. The risk of hot days has also increased across the western US. This figure shows the observed change in the number of (a) hot days (days at or above 95°F), (b) cold days (days at or below 32°F), and (c) warm nights (nights at or above 70°F) over the period 2002–2021 relative to 1901–1960 (1951–1960 for Alaska and Hawaii and 1956–1980 for Puerto Rico). Data were not available for the US-Affiliated Pacific Islands and the US Virgin Islands. Figure credit: Project Drawdown, Washington State University Vancouver, NOAA NCED, and CIRES NC.

Close inspection shows that this Figure contradicts the NCA5 Key Message with respect to heatwaves and instead reinforces the position of the NCA4. The time scale of analysis for this Figure is stated as the number of hot days, cold days and warm nights (respectively in panels a—c) over the period 2002–2021 compared to 1901–1960. Presumably (though not stated in the caption) the counts are per year. Notwithstanding Key Message 2.2 the leftmost panel shows that over most of CONUS the number of extreme heat days has decreased in recent decades compared to the prior century.

The accompanying discussion in NCA5 becomes convoluted since it appears to be aimed at supporting the Key Message despite the contrary evidence. NCA5 chapter 2 elaborates on KM2.2 by saying (p. 16):

Observations show an increase in the severity, extent, and/or frequency of multiple types of extreme events. Heatwaves have become more common and severe in the West since the 1980s (*high confidence*).

But it does not mention the decline elsewhere. On the next page (p. 17) it says:

By some measures, the most extreme heatwaves on record in the United States occurred during the Dust Bowl era of the 1930s. ... Globally such heatwaves are becoming more frequent, and in recent decades the western United States has been following those trends.

Reference to a global trend seems to be an attempt to tie heatwaves to climate change, but then the obvious question, unaddressed by NCA5, is why only part of the U.S. follows it while most of the

country is trending in the opposite direction. These issues were addressed in CWG25 Ch6, demonstrating that the range and magnitude of extreme temperatures (10s of degrees) are driven more by natural variability than the small extra forcing from the enhanced concentrations of CO₂. The data shown in CWG25 shows that in terms of both (a) hot days ($\geq 95^{\circ}\text{F}$) and (b) number of days in heatwaves, the current decade is experiencing no more than was experienced 100 years ago. For example, in the 30-year period 1925-1954, representing only 23% of the 1899-2024 data record, the CONUS experienced 33% of the total heat wave days. The most recent 30-years experienced 24%, almost exactly that expected by chance. Thus, the NCA5 claim that “multiday heatwaves have become hotter, more frequent, larger, and longer lasting in recent decades,” is seen to be simply false when expanding the temporal and spatial domains to encompass all available data (Ch6 Fig. 6.3.6 CWG25).

The NCA5 then pointed to the dramatic Pacific Northwest heatwave of 2021. CWG Section 8.6.1 discussed this event in detail, reviewing the findings of multiple peer-reviewed studies that explained the unusual meteorological conditions giving rise to it were unrelated to climate change, a point omitted from the NCA5 discussion.

NCA5 finally turns to the declining heatwave trend in CONUS east of the Rockies but attempts to reframe it by focusing on urban warm spells.

[The] number of very hot days has actually decreased across the central and eastern regions due to summer cooling trends in the region (Figure 2.7; Ch. 22). This does not, however, mean the central and eastern US are not affected by heat. The impacts of extreme high temperatures are more severe if such conditions persist for several days, and overall, multiday heatwaves have become hotter, more frequent, larger, and longer lasting in recent decades. Across 50 large US cities, the US Global Change Research Program heatwave indicator (<https://www.globalchange.gov/indicators/heat-waves>) shows that the average number of heatwaves has doubled since the 1980s, and the length of the heatwave season has increased from about 40 days to about 70 days.

We discussed this issue in CWG25 Section 6.3. The Figure referenced by NCA5 uses an *ad hoc* definition of heat wave, namely two consecutive days with minimum nighttime temperatures above the 85th percentile, and an *ad hoc* time scale which begins in the 1960s, the coldest decade in the last century, thus suppressing any comparison to the 1930s. Nighttime temperatures in urban areas have gone up faster than daytime temperatures (which the NCA5 acknowledges), but this is a signature of urban heat island effects and is not a good metric of climate change. CWG25 noted as well that the occurrence of hot days ($\geq 95^{\circ}\text{F}$) has recently increased in the West, but declined in the remainder of the country, and in the nationwide average, since 1899.

5 INADEQUATE TRACEABLE ACCOUNTS

Starting with the NCA3, the NCA has included a section on Traceable Accounts at the end of each Chapter. This is the description from the NCA5:

Each chapter concludes with a section entitled Traceable Accounts, which provides information on the overall process used to develop the chapter as well as a separate Traceable Account section for each Key Message. These Traceable Accounts describe the supporting evidence behind each Key Message, the process and rationale authors used in reaching their conclusions, and the author team's expert assessment of the confidence in and, where applicable, likelihood of these conclusions. As such, Traceable Accounts provide information about the state of the science, document sources of uncertainty, identify research gaps, and allow traceability to data and resources.

The Traceable Accounts for each Chapter and Key Message includes the following sections:

- Description of Evidence Base
- Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps
- Description of Confidence and Likelihood

The Traceable Accounts are in principle an important factor in addressing the NCA's statutory requirement to discuss scientific uncertainties. Further, the Traceable Accounts can help satisfy the Executive Order for Restoring Gold Standard Science with regards to: reproducibility, transparency, communication of error and uncertainty, and skepticism of findings and assumptions. However, the execution of the Traceable Accounts is uneven, often superficial and noninformative in Chapters 2 and 3 (which were the only Chapters investigated here). Here is an example from Key Message 2.2: Extreme Events are Becoming More Frequent and Severe.

Description of the Evidence Base consists of two paragraphs, with the first paragraph summarizing the findings and the second paragraph providing a generic description of the types of data that can be used for storms. Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps focuses on the uneven distribution across US populations due to differences in exposure and vulnerability. The only limitations in data referred to are the lack of a long-term record of lightning, and the lack of homogenized daily and hourly temperature data except from reanalysis products.

The most astonishing deficiency is in the Description of Confidence and Likelihood. One of the statements in Key Message 2.2 is: "Hurricanes have been intensifying more rapidly since the 1980s (high confidence) and causing heavier rainfall and higher storm surges (high confidence)." The Description of Confidence and Likelihood includes the following statement: "Basic physical understanding and climate models both provide robust explanations for the links between climate change and observed changes in these extremes: this is why the authors also have high confidence that storms are delivering more rainfall and high confidence that storm surges are becoming higher." No reference to journal publications or a specific data set is made in the Chapter regarding hurricane induced precipitation or storm surge to support this *high confidence* conclusion.

With regards to Chapter 3, there are some substantial inconsistencies between the Traceable Accounts for the different Key Findings:

Key Message 3-1: Human activities have caused global warming.

Confidence and Likelihood: “There is *very high confidence* that emissions of GHGs from human activities, fossil fuel use in particular, have *unequivocally* caused all global warming observed over the industrial era. There is also *very high confidence* that changes in natural climate drivers have had globally small and regionally variable long-term effects over this period.”

The Uncertainties section only addresses uncertainties in radiative forcing of greenhouse gases. By contrast, consider Key Message 3-4: Humans are changing Earth System processes. The Traceability Analysis in this section contains arguably the most scientifically credible text in the entire Chapter. From Description of Evidence Base: “In the last decade, there has been increasing recognition of the role of regional-scale natural variability in the past and future evolution of climate, as well as the fact that regional natural variability signals can be competitive with forced anthropogenic signals”. From Major Uncertainties and Research Gaps: “For example, the true natural variability of the climate system on decadal to centennial timescales could be larger than what we estimate from GCMs, which would further increase the irreducible uncertainty stemming from natural variability.”

As part of the Traceable Account: “Each figure and some tables are accompanied by a metadata survey, which can be accessed in the online version of the report by clicking on the eyeball icon above the figure or table (see the table below for explanations of additional icons used throughout the report). The metadata survey describes data sources, figure or table development methods, copyright information, and other important documentation.” Upon clicking on the eyeball icon above a particular figure, a Contact US email appears, addressed to the USGCRP. No attempt was made to send a email to elicit the Metadata information, but it is clear that this information is not readily accessible online.

In summary, the Traceable Analyses examined here, with few exceptions, fail to meet the stated objectives set forward by the NCA.

6 OVEREMPHASIS ON EXTREME SCENARIOS

To respond to the GCRA mandate to “project major trends for the subsequent 25 to 100 years,” the NCA relies on projections of future climate change based on estimates of future emissions (the so-called SSP scenarios) and/or specified levels of radiative forcing (the RCP scenarios). For the most part, NCA5 uses scenarios developed for the IPCC Assessment Reports.

In CWG Section 3.2.1 we presented a critical assessment of past and current IPCC scenario envelopes, showing that they have tended to overshoot observed emissions. The IPCC AR6 published in 2021 stated that “The likelihood of high-emission scenarios like RCP8.5 and SSP5-8.5 is considered low in light of recent energy sector developments.” In 2021, UN Climate Negotiators (COP) stopped using scenarios above 4.5. NCA5 makes the following observations about the scenarios they use:

“NCA5 authors were advised to assess the full range of scenarios available.” (Front Matter)

“Scenarios of future emissions and land-use change are developed as plausible alternatives, but no relative likelihood is attached to them. Some recent studies, however, have argued that the highest scenario, SSP5-8.5, is no longer plausible without a reversal of current trends in the adoption of renewables and energy efficiency.” (Key Message 3.3 Traceable Analysis)

Despite acknowledging the issue the NCA5 otherwise ignored the problem. A keyword search of the NCA5 of mentions of RCP/SSP scenarios finds over 50% referred to the extreme emissions scenarios RCP8.5/SSP5-8.5. Further, 10 figures *only* included the 8.5 scenarios: 5.2, 6.9, 7.4, 11.3, 14.6, 22.13, 22.19, 27.9, 29.13.

The problem of relying on extreme scenarios is particularly acute for NCA5’s sea level rise projections. The sea level rise scenarios used in the NCA5 do not relate directly to the SSP emissions scenarios, but to specified amounts of sea level rise by 2100, whereby Low relates to 0.3 m (0.98 feet), Intermediate-Low relates to 0.5 m (1.64 feet), Intermediate relates to 1.0 m (3.28 feet), Intermediate-High relates to 1.5 m (4.92 feet), and High relates to 2.0 m (6.56 feet). (Table 4 of Guide to Using this Report).

Table 4. Descriptive Terms for Common Sea Level Rise Scenarios Used in NCA5

Future global mean sea level rise and sea level rise along United States coastline are shown for five scenarios in feet (and meters), relative to a 2000 baseline. The US values shown in the right half of the table are averaged across the US coastal regions, including the contiguous US, Alaska, Hawaii and the US-Affiliated Pacific Islands, and the US Caribbean. The national values shown in the table differ substantially from regional values. For example, sea level rise is higher in the Gulf Coast and lower or even negative in some parts of Alaska. In the next 10 years (2020–2030), sea level along the contiguous US coasts is expected to rise 0.92 feet (0.28 m), the same amount of sea level rise observed over the last 100 years (1920–2020). See Chapter 9 for regional sea level information. Adapted from Sweet et al. 2022.¹

Sea Level Rise Scenario Descriptor	Global Mean Sea Level			United States		
	2050	2100	2150	2050	2100	2150
Low	0.49 (0.15)	0.98 (0.3)	1.31 (0.4)	0.59 (0.18)	0.98 (0.3)	1.64 (0.5)
Intermediate-Low	0.66 (0.20)	1.64 (0.5)	2.62 (0.8)	0.75 (0.23)	1.64 (0.5)	2.95 (0.9)
Intermediate	0.92 (0.28)	3.28 (1.0)	6.23 (1.9)	0.89 (0.27)	3.28 (1.0)	6.89 (2.1)
Intermediate-High	1.21 (0.37)	4.92 (1.5)	8.86 (2.7)	1.12 (0.34)	4.92 (1.5)	8.86 (2.7)
High	1.41 (0.43)	6.56 (2.0)	12.14 (3.7)	1.38 (0.42)	6.56 (2.0)	12.46 (3.8)

Considering only projections representing processes in whose quantification there is at least medium confidence, the IPCC AR6 assessed global mean sea level projections for 2100 to fall between 0.2 and 1.6 m (5th—95th percentile range). Nevertheless, the range of sea level rise scenarios considered by the NCA5 extends to 2.0 m. Further, the NCA5 neglects to include plausible lower scenarios, such as 0.2 m cited by the IPCC, which also corresponds to the average rate of sea level rise over the past century.

With regards to actual predictions of sea level rise, Chapter 9 of the NCA states: “Under a range of potential global warming levels, average sea level along US coastlines is *likely* to be between 12 and 20 inches above 2000 sea levels in 2050.” These values of sea level rise encompass the Intermediate scenario to values slightly higher than the High scenario from Table 4.

Global sea level rise projections to 2050 relative to a 2000 baseline can be evaluated with respect to the observed global sea level rise from 2000-2024, which is approximately 3.39 inches (0.28 feet). <https://www.climate.gov/news-features/understanding-climate/climate-change-global-sea-level> Hence NCA5 is projecting values of sea level rise between 2025 and 2050 that are 3.5 to 5.8 times the rate observed during 2000-2024.

Chapter 9 further states: “Looking toward the future, an 11 inch (28 cm) average rise along the contiguous US coastline is expected by 2050 (relative to 2020), with a *likely* range of 9-13 inches.” With regards to confidence levels, NCA5 Chapter 9 Traceable Accounts states: “There is *high confidence* and it is *likely* that sea levels will rise about 11 inches (likely range of about 9–13 inches) between 2020 and 2050”

In summary, the NCA5 presents future sea level rise scenarios that are not directly relatable either to SSP/RCP emissions scenarios or Global Warming Levels. The NCA5 scenarios include some that are higher than the 95th percentile for the extreme emissions scenario RCP8.5 that include hypothesized ice sheet processes for which there is low confidence. Projections to 2050 require rates of sea level rise from 2025 to 2050 that are more than three times the rate observed during 2020-2024. Further, the NCA5 ascribes *high confidence* to these sea level rise projections.

In summary, the NCA5 inclusion, and even the focus, on implausible extreme emissions scenarios supports projections of alarming impacts that are very unlikely to be driven by anthropogenic warming.

7 BIASED SELECTION OF REFERENCES

THIS IS WHERE THE RP JR example should go.

8 SUMMARY: EVALUATION OF THE NCA5

8.1 Inadequate NASEM Review

The NASEM Review failed to raise the issues we have discussed herein. Much of it focused on social and policy issues (e.g., Comments on Equity and Justice), rather than on the underlying science. In our assessment NASEM failed to apply the serious rigor one would expect. A few extracted comments from it will illustrate. Note that NASEM review comments are included here in blue font for reference. NASEM praised Chapter 2, saying:

The chapter [2] meets the requirements of Section 106 of the GCRA.

Yet contrary to the requirements of Section 106 the NCA5 did not discuss natural variability let alone assess the full climate record available for quantifying natural variability. Chapter 2 actually minimizes natural variability by claiming (unsubstantiated) skill in attributing recent extremes to human causes. For example NCA5's Chapter 2 Introduction states,

"...recent advances in attribution science (KM 3.3) mean that the role of climate change in some extreme events can now be quantified in real time. For example, climate change made the record-breaking Pacific Northwest heatwave of June 2021 2° to 4°F hotter, and in 2017 ..."

CWG25 reviews the expert literature demonstrating that this particular event would have happened with or without climate change and that for the CONUS, hot extremes are no more frequent now than they were in the past. NASEM did not challenge the unsubstantiated attribution claims in the NCA5.

Notwithstanding NASEM's claim that the Chapter complies with Section 106 of the GCRA it then acknowledged the absence of discussion of natural variability:

...the discussion and references regarding the role of natural climate variability and its regional differences are missing.

While a nod to natural variability is occasionally found in NCA5, it is usually followed by a "however" to emphasize human influence. One example is the statement just before the claim mentioned above pertaining to extreme event attribution: "There has always been extreme weather, which occurs even in an unchanged climate due to the natural variability of the Earth system. However, recent advances in attribution science (KM 3.3) mean that the role of climate change in some extreme events can now be quantified in real time..."

We pointed out that the evidence regarding heatwaves directly contradicts Key Message 2.2. NASEM did not mention this, instead it focused on a somewhat esoteric issue of terminology:

"Extreme Events Are Becoming More Frequent and Severe."

Key Message 2.2 is another generally well written key message. However, while the title of this key message includes the word "risk," the key message is exclusively about hazard. The Committee suggests rewriting the key message title to more accurately reflect the discussion on hazards.

The NASEM review appears to accept the NCA5's use of short data records because it makes no critical remarks about the failure to assess long time series, except for its observation that the use of short records makes the omission of natural variability that much more of a problem:

It is also important to point out that the influence of natural climate variability becomes particularly strong when the climate trend is computed based on short periods of time or small geographic areas.

This comment was largely ignored in the NCA5 final text.

8.2 Pertinent aspects when evaluating NCA5 in light of statutory requirements

- not our remit to make a ruling but here are aspects to consider in light of statutory requirements

8.3 Evaluation from the perspective of expert users of the report

- we have deep knowledge of the topics surveyed by the NCA5 authors
- we do not have confidence that the report was balanced and comprehensive
- we can point to many specific instances in which the report did not exhibit an appropriate level of quality or integrity as a scientific document
- we have reason to believe the whole process, from author selection to handling of expert reviews, was biased towards reinforcing foregone conclusions and alarmist messaging

8.4 Evaluation from the perspective of citizens interested in good policymaking

- Public concerns about climate change are valid, as are concerns about cost of living, economic growth, employment, etc.
- We share the general concern that elected officials and those who serve them have the best information available when making important decisions around energy and climate policy
- NCA5 was a missed opportunity: it could have been a valuable input to that process but it did not turn out that way
- consequently its usage is unlikely to lead to better decisions and would more likely increase the error rate in policy formation and we recommend it not be used for policymaking purposes.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: Seth's letter on statutory requirements for NCA5

APPENDIX 2: Analysis of 141 U.S. Longterm Daily Precipitation Records.




Figure. Stations used in the following analyses.

Table codes: (-) neg insignificant, -- neg significant, (+) pos insignificant, ++ pos significant.

Column 1: Measure

Column 2: Number of stations in that region

Column 3: Count of stations exhibiting a significant positive trend

Column 3: Count of stations exhibiting a significant negative trend

Column 5: Characteristic of region-wide trend

PACIFIC COAST

Since 1893:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	29	0	1	(-)
2-day average	29	0	1	(-)
Avg on non-zero days	29	0	9	--
Variability	29	1	0	(+)
Annual max	29	2	1	(+)

Number of 99 th pct exceedances	29	1	0	(-)
--	----	---	---	-----


Since 1950:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	29	0	1	(-)
2-day average	29	0	1	(-)
Avg on non-zero days	29	0	4	(-)
Variability	29	2	3	(-)
Annual max	29	6	3	(-)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	29	2	1	(-)

Since 1980:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	29	0	0	(-)
2-day average	29	0	0	(-)
Avg on non-zero days	29	0	1	(-)
Variability	29	0	0	(-)
Annual max	29	2	1	(-)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	29	0	0	(+)

Annual No. 99th Percentile Exceedances PC 1893-2024



SOUTHEAST

Since 1873:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	24	1	1	(+)
2-day average	24	1	1	(+)
Avg on non-zero days	24	7	2	(+)
Variability	24	1	0	(+)
Annual max	24	2	0	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	24	5	0	(+)


Since 1950:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	24	5	0	++
2-day average	24	5	0	++
Avg on non-zero days	24	5	1	++
Variability	24	6	0	++
Annual max	24	4	0	++
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	24	4	0	(+)

Since 1980:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	24	5	0	(+)
2-day average	24	5	0	(+)
Avg on non-zero days	24	5	1	(+)
Variability	24	3	0	(+)
Annual max	24	4	0	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	24	4	0	(+)

Annual No. 99th Percentile Exceedances SE 1873-2024



MIDWEST

Since 1893:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	61	23	0	++
2-day average	61	23	0	++
Avg on non-zero days	61	2	12	(+)
Variability	61	12	0	++
Annual max	61	9	0	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	61	10	0	(+)


Since 1950:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	61	28	2	++
2-day average	61	28	2	++
Avg on non-zero days	61	11	1	++
Variability	61	16	0	(+)
Annual max	61	8	0	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	61	19	0	++

Since 1980:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	61	6	1	(+)
2-day average	61	6	1	(+)
Avg on non-zero days	61	8	2	(+)
Variability	61	5	1	(+)
Annual max	61	0	1	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	61	5	3	(-)

Annual No. 99th Percentile Exceedances MW 1893-2024



NORTHEAST

Since 1888:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	27	12	0	++
2-day average	27	12	0	++
Avg on non-zero days	27	7	1	(+)
Variability	27	4	0	(+)
Annual max	27	3	0	(-)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	27	5	0	(+)


Since 1950:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	27	12	0	++
2-day average	27	12	0	++
Avg on non-zero days	27	7	1	(+)
Variability	27	4	0	(+)
Annual max	27	3	0	(-)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	27	5	0	++

Since 1980:

	No. stns	+ trends	- trends	region
1-day average	27	10	1	++
2-day average	27	10	1	++
Avg on non-zero days	27	6	0	(+)
Variability	27	2	0	(+)
Annual max	27	1	0	(+)
Number of 99 th pct exceedances	27	1	1	++

Annual No. 99th Percentile Exceedances NE 1888-2024



From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:24 AM
To: Ross McKittrick
Cc: Judith Curry; Roy W. Spencer; Steven Koonin; Travis Fisher; Josh Loucks; Seth Cohen
Subject: Re: NCA5 report June 18 edition

Ross/Steve

Section 4.2. “... last 100 years” rather than “... last century”. (1960’s coldest since 1910’s)

Section 6. Typo. “2000-2024” rather than 2020-2024”.

NASEM review. This is indeed weak as I was only looking at the problems as part of the extreme temperature section. Don’t know if we have the bandwidth to do this chapter well.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jun 18, 2025, at 8:07 AM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

> In this edition I have accepted the edits up to this point except where they call for deletion of large sections or (as in section 8) a major rewrite.

> All footnotes are either incorporated into the text or converted to a reference list which is now at the end.

> In some of the places where Steve or Judy had asked for clarification I've rephrased the text.

> Etc.

> Over to Roy.

>


> <01.NCA5.Review.June18 [SEK][JCurry][RMck].docx>

From: Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]
Sent: 4/25/2025 8:35:34 PM
To: John Christy [climatemanager60@gmail.com]
CC: Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; Roy Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; Steve Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]
Subject: heat/cold mortality
Attachments: heat_cold mortality(1).docx

Text for heat/cold mortality is attached. It is short, someone may want to flesh this out

.....

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

2.3 Mortality risks from heat and cold extremes

The greatest confidence for impacts from global warming is an increase in extreme heat events and a decrease in extreme cold events; this has been observed in the historical period and is also expected with continued warming.

Mortality from heat extremes is typically caused by heat stroke and heat exhaustion. Mortality from cold extremes is typically caused by hypothermia and heart strain. It is well known that global mortality is substantially greater for extreme cold than for extreme heat.^{1,2}

Specifically with regards to the U.S., extreme heat and extreme cold both kill hundreds of people each year.; however, different approaches to assessing heat/cold mortality produces different results. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics Compressed Mortality Database, which is based on death certificates, indicates that about twice as many people die of “excessive cold” conditions in a given year than of “excessive heat.”^{3,4}

A 2015 epidemiological study of deaths in published in *The Lancet* found that cold-related deaths in the U.S. were about a factor of fifteen higher than heat-related deaths.⁵ However, the study did not adjust for the seasonal cycle in mortality rates, which tend to increase during the winter months due to non-weather factors like influenza.⁶ A more recent paper found that 86% of temperature-related deaths in the U.S. are due to cold-related mortality.⁷

The IPCC AR6 Working Group 2 Chapter 16.2.3.5 states how heat-related mortality is declining over time:⁸

“Heat-attributable mortality fractions have declined over time in most countries owing to general improvements in health care systems, increasing prevalence of residential air

¹ Qi Zhao et al., “Global, Regional, and National Burden of Mortality Associated with Non-Optimal Ambient Temperatures from 2000 to 2019: A Three-Stage Modelling Study,” *The Lancet Planetary Health* 5, no. 7 (July 2021), [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196\(21\)00081-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00081-4).

² <https://ourworldindata.org/part-one-how-many-people-die-from-extreme-temperatures-and-how-could-this-change-in-the-future>

³ Brett R. Scheffers et al., “The Broad Footprint of Climate Change from Genes to Biomes to People,” *Science* 354, no. 6313 (November 11, 2016): aaf7671, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf7671>.

⁴ Rachel H. Alinsky, Scott E. Hadland, J. Deanna Wilson, Pamela A. Matson, and Brendan Saloner, “Trends in Polysubstance Overdose Deaths Involving Opioids, Stimulants, and Benzodiazepines by Race and Ethnicity in the US, 2007-2021,” *JAMA Network Open* 7, no. 3 (March 2024): e238249, <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.8249>.

⁵ Lancet Commission on Climate and Health, “Health and Climate Change: Policy Responses to Protect Public Health,” *The Lancet* 386, no. 10006 (November 7, 2015): 1861–1914, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(15\)60854-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60854-6).

⁶ Bob Henson, “Which Kills More People: Extreme Heat or Extreme Cold?” *Weather Underground*, January 22, 2019, <https://www.wunderground.com/cat6/Which-Kills-More-People-Extreme-Heat-or-Extreme-Cold>.

⁷ Tarik Benmarhnia et al., “Deaths Attributable to Heat and Cold: Comparison of Data Sources and Evaluation of Inconsistencies,” *GeoHealth* 8, no. 3 (March 2024): e2023GH000799, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GH000799>.

⁸ B. O'Neill et al., “Key Risks Across Sectors and Regions,” in *Climate Change 2022: Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Geneva, CH: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021), 2411–2538.

conditioning, and behavioral changes. These factors, which determine the susceptibility of the population to heat, have predominated over the influence of temperature change.”

A 2011 study of 40 major US cities between 1975 and 2004, found that heat wave mortality had decreased, in spite of rising temperatures, due to adaptation.⁹

By reducing mortality from cold events and adapting to heat extremes, rising temperatures are associated with a net saving of lives.

⁹ Keith T. Ingram, Carolyn W. Furman, and John W. Jones, “Climate Change Impact and Adaptation Assessment: A Guide for Coastal Resources Managers,” *Weather, Climate, and Society* 3, no. 4 (October 2011): 234–249, <https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-11-00055.1>.

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 4:24 PM
To: John Christy
Cc: Travis Fisher; Ross McKittrick; Roy Spencer; Steve Koonin
Subject: Sea level rise
Attachments: Sea level (1) .docx

Text for sea level rise is attached. I focus on IPCC stuff, and tide gauge observations at selected cities. Have we decided on units? For example, i use inches instead of mm, meters.



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

8 Changes in Sea level

Arguably the most important climate impact driver that is unambiguously associated with increasing temperatures is global sea level rise. Global warming increases sea level rise through thermal expansion of the volume of sea water and melting of glaciers and ice sheets. Another factor that influences sea level variations is land water storage. Regional sea level change is influenced by large-scale ocean circulation patterns, and geologic processes and deformation from the redistribution of ice and water. Local sea level rise is further influenced by vertical land motion from geologic processes, ground water withdrawal, and fossil fuel extraction.

The IPCC AR6 estimates that global mean sea level increased by 7.9 (5.9–9.8) inches between 1901 and 2018. The rate of sea level rise has accelerated in recent decades. At the ocean basin scale, sea levels have risen fastest in the Western Pacific and slowest in the Eastern Pacific over the period 1993–2018.¹ The rate of global sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year (for reference: 0.12 in is the height of two stacked pennies).²

The observing systems for global sea level rise have advanced significantly in the satellite era, particularly with the advent of satellite altimeters since 1993. Local tide gauges have provided useful data for the past century, and even longer for a few locations. Following the end of the Little Ice Age in the mid-nineteenth century, tide gauges show that the global mean sea level began rising during the period 1820–1860.

8.1 U.S. coastal sea level rise

Observed and predicted rates of mean global sea level rise may have little relevance for specific locations³. In Canada and Alaska (and also northern Washington), sea level is actually decreasing, owing to uplift from glacial rebound. Most of the Pacific coast has rates of sea level rise of 0 to 0.12 inches/year. The largest rates of sea level rise are on the Gulf coast (Louisiana and Texas) and in the mid-Atlantic states (Chesapeake Bay region).

Measurements of relative sea level rise from tide gauges conflate the rise in the volume of seawater with local vertical land motion. Hence in examining local sea level changes, it is important to also consider the local vertical land motion. Absolute local sea level rise is the sum of relative sea level rise and the local vertical land motion.

A wide range of processes can cause vertical land motion along the coasts, having amplitudes comparable to the sea level signals expected from land-ice melting or ocean thermal expansion. Vertical land motion on the coasts can locally exacerbate (subsidence/sinking) or mitigate (uplift) the risk of sea level rise. Local changes in sea level vary considerably from place to place and can

¹ B. Fox-Kemper et al., “Ocean, Cryosphere and Sea Level Change,” in *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Geneva, CH: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021), 1211-1362.

² “Rising Waters: How NASA Is Monitoring Sea Level Rise,” NASA (NASA), accessed May 19, 2022, <https://www.nasa.gov/specials/sea-level-rise-2020/>.

³ <https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/>

deviate substantially from the rate of global mean sea level change.⁴ Human activities triggering subsidence are soil drainage (e.g. for urban development purposes) or subsurface mining of resources such as groundwater, oil or gas. The magnitude of relative sea level rise caused by human activities is often considerable. Local vertical land motion of relevance to local sea level change is best measured using a Global Positioning System (GPS) station located in the location as the tide gauge.

Table 8.1 shows absolute sea-level rise (ASLR) for selected locations, determined from the sum of uncorrected sea-level rise as estimated from tide gauge time series (RSLR)⁵ and the vertical land motion (VLM)^{6, 7, 8} measurements. The absolute sea level rise for each of these locations is significantly smaller than the measured relative sea level rise owing to local sinking of the land. More than half of the measured relative sea level rise is attributed to land sinking for these locations: San Francisco, Galveston, Grand Isle. For reference, the global average rate of absolute sea level rise is estimated to be 0.12 inches/year.

Table 8.1 Absolute sea level rise (inches/year) (RSLR plus VLM)

Location	RSLR	VLM	ASLR
San Francisco, CA	+0.08	-0.06	+0.02
Galveston, TX	+0.26	-0.19	+0.07
Grand Isle, LA	+0.36	-0.28	+0.08
St Petersburg, FL	+0.12	-0.02	+0.10
New York City, NY	+0.11	-0.05	+0.06

San Francisco Bay

Over the past 100 years, relative sea level in the San Francisco Bay area has risen by 7.8 inches, at an average rate of 0.08 inches/year (Figure 8.1). As shown in Table 6.1, San Francisco's vertical land motion is -0.06 inches/year (sinking), producing a recent rate of absolute sea level rise of +0.02 inches/year. Portions of Treasure Island, San Francisco International Airport, and Foster City are sinking as fast as 0.4 inches/year.⁹ Landfill zones are sinking due to soil compaction, at a rate as much as one-half inch per year, threatening coastal infrastructure including the San Francisco International Airport. The problems in the San Francisco Bay area have been caused primarily by sinking in landfill regions that were formerly wetlands, not by the slow creep of global sea level rise.

⁴ Wöppelmann, G., and M. Marcos (2016), Vertical land motion as a key to understanding sea level change and variability, *Rev. Geophys.*, 54, 64–92.

⁵ NOAA Tides & Currents, Relative Sea Level Trends - <https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/>

⁶ NAS (2012) *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*. Appendix A: Vertical Land Motion and Sea-Level Data Along the West Coast of the United States. National Academies Press, NAP.edu/10766.

⁷ Letetrel, C, M Karpytchev, MN Bouin et al (2015) Estimation of vertical land movement rates along the coasts of the Gulf of Mexico over the past decades. *Continental Shelf Research*, 111, 42-51.

⁸ Karegar, MA, TH Dixon, SE Engelhart (2016), Subsidence along the Atlantic Coast of North America: Insights from GPS and late Holocene relative sea level data, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 3126–3133, doi:10.1002/2016GL068015.

⁹ Shirzaei, M, R Burgmann (2018) Global climate change and local land subsidence exacerbate inundation risk to the San Francisco Bay Area. *Science Advances*, 4, eaap9234




Figure 8.1. Tide gauge measurements at San Francisco, California, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=9414290 (downloaded 4/22/25).

Galveston - Houston

Long-term tide measurements at Galveston Pier 21 show sea level rise of 2.18 feet in the past century, or a rate of 0.26 inches/year (Figure 8.2). Vertical land motion (subsidence) at Galveston is estimated at -0.19 inches/year, yielding a value of absolute sea level rise of +0.07 inches/year (Table 8.1). The U.S. Geologic Survey found that most of the land-surface subsidence in the Houston-Galveston region has occurred as a direct result of groundwater withdrawals.¹⁰ This caused compaction of the aquifer sediments, mostly in the fine-grained silt and clay layers. By 1979, as much as 10 feet of subsidence had occurred in Houston.

Hurricanes are traditionally the major concern in the region. The 1900 hurricane that struck Galveston and killed between 6,000 and 12,000 people is still considered the United States' deadliest natural disaster.¹¹ Hurricane Ike (2008) decimated large portions of the Bolivar Peninsula literally removing significant portions of the land mass.¹² While only 17 people were killed in Texas, property damage exceeded \$50 billion.¹³ In 2017, Hurricane Harvey struck the region, bringing catastrophic rainfall-triggered flooding that inflicted over \$125 billion in damages.¹⁴

¹⁰ Kasmarek, M.C., and Ramage, J.K., 2017, Water-level altitudes 2017 and water-level changes in the Chicot, Evangeline, and Jasper aquifers and compaction 1973–2016 in the Chicot and Evangeline aquifers, Houston-Galveston region, Texas: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2017–5080, 32 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20175080>.

¹¹ Weems, John Edward, "Galveston Hurricane of 1900", Texas State Historical Association, (March 15, 2016) <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/galveston-hurricane-of-1900>.

¹² "Galveston County, Texas, Faces Sea Level Rise and Storms", Union of Concerned Scientists, (June 23, 2017) <https://www.ucs.org/resources/galveston-county-texas-faces-sea-level-rise-and-storms>.

¹³ White, Audrey, "Galveston Still Healing 5 Years After Hurricane Ike", The Texas Tribune, (April 26, 2013) <https://www.texastribune.org/2013/04/26/galveston-still-healing-5-years-after-hurricane-ike/>.

¹⁴ NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) U.S. Billion-Dollar Weather and Climate Disasters (2025). <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/>, DOI: 10.25921/stkw-7w73




Figure 8.2. Tide gauge measurements Galveston Pier, TX, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8771450 (downloaded 4/22/2025).

New Orleans and the Mississippi delta

There are long-term tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, Louisiana, respectively estimating that sea level has risen slightly more than 3 feet over the last 100 years and at an average rate of 0.36 inches/year (Figure 8.3). Vertical land motion (subsidence) is estimated -0.28 inches/year at Grand Isle. From Table 6.1, the absolute sea level rise is +0.08 inches/year at Grand Isle.




Figure 8.3. Tide gauge measurements at Grand Isle, LA, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8761724 (downloaded 4/22/25).

The issues of sea level rise and land loss in the Mississippi delta region are complex, with geological subsidence and the decline in sediment transported by the Mississippi river being the dominant drivers. Due to the construction of dams in the basin since the 1950s, the suspended

sediment load of the Mississippi River has decreased by ~50%.¹⁵ A new subsidence map of coastal Louisiana finds the coastal region to be sinking at about one third of an inch per year.¹⁶ For a city whose elevation averages one to two feet below sea level, sea level rise from human caused warming is not the dominant driver for the problems that New Orleans is facing.

New York City

New York City is particularly vulnerable to the effects of sea level rise because it is built primarily on islands and has 520 miles of coastline. In New York City, relative sea level has risen over 11 inches over the past century, at an average rate of 0.11 inches/year (Figure 8.4). Vertical land motion in the New York City area is occurring at a rate of -0.05 inches/year (subsidence), corresponding to roughly 5 inches per century. From Table 6.1, the absolute rate of sea level rise at The Battery location is 0.06 inches/year, or about 55% of the measured relative sea level rise.




Figure 8.4. Tide gauge measurements at The Battery, New York, obtained from NOAA - https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?id=8518750 (downloaded 4/22/25).

Following Hurricane Sandy, New York has developed a comprehensive plan: *City of New York: Building a Stronger, More Resilient New York*.¹⁷ A broad range of coastal protection measures are outlined that match the risks facing a given area: increase coastal edge elevations, minimize upland wave zones, infrastructure to protect against storm surge, improve coastal design and governance, restore estuaries wetlands, coastal nourishment, site elevation, and drainage systems.

¹⁵ Jillian M. Maloney et al., “Mississippi River Subaqueous Delta Is Entering a Stage of Retrogradation,” *Marine Geology* 400 (June 2018): 12–23, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2018.03.001>.

¹⁶ Jaap H. Nienhuis et al., “A New Subsidence Map for Coastal Louisiana,” *GSA Today* 27, no. 6 (June 2017): 28–29, <https://doi.org/10.1130/GSATG337GW.1>.

¹⁷ City of New York, *A Stronger, More Resilient New York* (New York: City of New York, June 2013), http://s-media.nyc.gov/agencies/sirr/SIRR_singles_Hi_res.pdf.

8.2 Sea level rise projections

The concern over sea level rise is not about the 8 inches or so that global mean sea level has risen since 1900. Rather, the concern is about projections of 21st century sea level rise based on climate model-based projections of human-caused global warming.

The IPCC AR6 finds that there is *high agreement* across published global mean sea level projections for 2050 and there is little sensitivity to emissions scenarios. Considering only projections incorporating ice-sheet processes in whose quantification there is at least *medium confidence*, the global sea level projections for 2050, across all emissions scenarios, fall between 3.94 and 15.75 inches (5th–95th percentile *very likely* range) relative to the 1995–2014 baseline period.¹⁸

Conversely, there is *low agreement* across published global mean sea level projections for 2100, particularly for higher emissions scenarios. Considering only projections representing processes in whose quantification there is at least *medium confidence*, the AR6 global mean sea level projections for 2100 lie between 7.87 and 39.37 inches (5th–95th percentile *very likely* range) under the medium emissions scenario SSP2–4.5.¹⁹ There is deep uncertainty surrounding projections of sea level rise to 2100, particularly for the higher emissions scenarios.

In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995–2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025. From the tide gauge measurements in Figures 8.1–8.4, there is no obvious acceleration in sea level rise beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

8.3 Summary

Since 1900, global sea level has risen by about 8". Sea level change along U.S. coasts is highly variable, associated with local variations in processes that contribute to sinking and also ocean circulation patterns. The highest levels of sea level rise along U.S. coasts are Galveston, New Orleans, and the Chesapeake Bay regions – each of these locations is associated with substantial local sinking that is unrelated to climate change.

Extreme projections of global sea level rise are associated with the implausible extreme emissions scenario and inclusion of poorly understood processes associated with hypothesized ice sheet instabilities. In evaluating the IPCC AR6 projections to 2050 (with reference to the baseline period 1995–2014), almost half of the sea level rise has already occurred by 2025 and at a lower rate than predicted. From the tide gauge measurements in Figures 8.1–8.4, there is no obvious acceleration in sea level rise beyond the historical average rate of sea level rise.

¹⁸ B. Fox-Kemper et al., “Ocean, Cryosphere and Sea Level Change,” in *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Geneva, CH: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2021), 1211–1362.

¹⁹ B. Fox-Kemper et al., “Ocean, Cryosphere and Sea Level Change.”

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 11:04 AM
To: Ross McKittrick
Cc: Judith Curry; Roy Spencer; Steven Koonin; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: "Increasing CO2 and the Alkaline Oceans"

Roy

At end of second paragraph, something like:

For example, modern corals developed during the Mesozoic era (252-66 million years ago) when atmospheric CO2 levels were two to five times present-day values (Stanley 2003).

Stanley, G.D. 2003, The evolution of modern corals and their evolutionary history. Earth Sci Rev, 60, 195-225.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012825202001046?via%3Dihub>

John C.

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 8:13 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:
Agreed, it's excellent.

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 8:53 AM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
I like it! concise and very nicely written, about the right length for this topic

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 4:05 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:
Attached find my draft of this section, with references. Note the change in title from "Ocean Alkalinity" because "alkalinity" refers to the buffering capacity of water against pH changes, whereas "alkaline" refers to pH above 7 (a confusing bit of chemical nuance).
-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 6:20 PM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Subject: April 29 update

I've created a Dropbox folder called 00.Report Draft where I am hoping we can accumulate current drafts of each chapter (the 00. prefix keeps it at the top of the list).
In the Front Matter file I've put the Table of Contents as best I understand it, with the various additions we've discussed. Also I've put current drafts of chapters 1 and 4, the latter which includes my stab at aerosols. These files are in the Dropbox and attached.
This evening or tomorrow morning I'll populate the folder with the most recent versions of all the other chapters i have. Feel free to do likewise.



--
Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 9:14 AM
To: Judith Curry
Cc: Roy Spencer; Steven Koonin; John Christy; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: "Increasing CO2 and the Alkaline Oceans"

Agreed, it's excellent.

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 8:53 AM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
I like it! concise and very nicely written, about the right length for this topic

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 4:05 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:
Attached find my draft of this section, with references. Note the change in title from "Ocean Alkalinity" because "alkalinity" refers to the buffering capacity of water against pH changes, whereas "alkaline" refers to pH above 7 (a confusing bit of chemical nuance).
-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 6:20 PM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Subject: April 29 update

I've created a Dropbox folder called 00.Report Draft where I am hoping we can accumulate current drafts of each chapter (the 00. prefix keeps it at the top of the list).
In the Front Matter file I've put the Table of Contents as best I understand it, with the various additions we've discussed. Also I've put current drafts of chapters 1 and 4, the latter which includes my stab at aerosols. These files are in the Dropbox and attached.
This evening or tomorrow morning I'll populate the folder with the most recent versions of all the other chapters i have. Feel free to do likewise.

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Roy Spencer
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Steven Koonin; John Christy; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: "Increasing CO2 and the Alkaline Oceans"

I like it! concise and very nicely written, about the right length for this topic

On Wed, Apr 30, 2025 at 4:05 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

Attached find my draft of this section, with references. Note the change in title from "Ocean Alkalinity" because "alkalinity" refers to the buffering capacity of water against pH changes, whereas "alkaline" refers to pH above 7 (a confusing bit of chemical nuance).

-Roy


From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 6:20 PM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Subject: April 29 update

I've created a Dropbox folder called 00.Report Draft where I am hoping we can accumulate current drafts of each chapter (the 00. prefix keeps it at the top of the list).

In the Front Matter file I've put the Table of Contents as best I understand it, with the various additions we've discussed. Also I've put current drafts of chapters 1 and 4, the latter which includes my stab at aerosols. These files are in the Dropbox and attached.

This evening or tomorrow morning I'll populate the folder with the most recent versions of all the other chapters i have. Feel free to do likewise.

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Roy Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]
Sent: 4/30/2025 11:05:55 AM
To: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; John Christy [climateman60@gmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]
Subject: "Increasing CO2 and the Alkaline Oceans"
Attachments: Increasing CO2 and the Alkaline Oceans [RS].docx

Attached find my draft of this section, with references. Note the change in title from "Ocean Alkalinity" because "alkalinity" refers to the buffering capacity of water against pH changes, whereas "alkaline" refers to pH above 7 (a confusing bit of chemical nuance).

-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2025 6:20 PM
To: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Subject: April 29 update

I've created a Dropbox folder called 00.Report Draft where I am hoping we can accumulate current drafts of each chapter (the 00. prefix keeps it at the top of the list).

In the Front Matter file I've put the Table of Contents as best I understand it, with the various additions we've discussed. Also I've put current drafts of chapters 1 and 4, the latter which includes my stab at aerosols. These files are in the Dropbox and attached.

This evening or tomorrow morning I'll populate the folder with the most recent versions of all the other chapters i have. Feel free to do likewise.

Increasing CO₂ and the Alkaline Oceans

The modern-day global average pH of sea water is estimated to be 8.1, down from an estimated value of 8.2 in pre-Industrial times (Gattuso and Hansson, 2011). As CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere increase, more is absorbed by the oceans. Depending upon the alkalinity (buffering capacity) of the oceans, the oceans are expected to become somewhat less alkaline over time, putatively explaining the decrease in pH from 8.2 to 8.1 over the last few hundred years.

While this process is often called “ocean acidification”, this is a misnomer because the oceans are not expected to become acidic (pH less than 7.0). Even if that was to happen, it is believed that life in the oceans evolved during a period when the oceans were mildly acidic, with a pH of 6.5 to 7.0 (Krissansen-Totton et al., 2018).

For many years it was assumed that a decreasing pH of sea water would reduce the calcification rate of coral reefs. But coral reefs already endure large swings in pH, partly due to daily photosynthetic activity in the reef. This results in pH values that have been measured to range from 9.4 during the day to 7.5 at night (Revelle and Fairbridge, 1957).

In 2009 it was reported that a portion of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef (GBR, the world’s largest coral reef ecosystem) had experienced a 14% decline in calcification since 1990 (De’ath et al., 2009). This was tentatively attributed to increasing water temperature and decreasing pH of seawater. But since that time, the initial 2009 report of reduced calcification rates in the GBR was reported to have been the result of a bias in the data analysis (Ridd et al., 2013), and correction for this bias led to no change in calculated calcification rates. Nevertheless, the alarm produced by the original paper has persisted as evidenced by the large number of published citations (541) received by the original study as compared to only 11 citations for the subsequent study (as of 30 April 2025).

Given the reported declines in GBR coverage between 1990 and 2009, it has come as a surprise that the decline reversed over the last decade or so, with Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution asking, “*Is the Great Barrier Reef Making a Comeback?*” (Woods Hole, 2023). The most recent annual summary of GBR conditions from the Australian Institute of Marine Science was titled, *Continued Coral Recovery Leads to 36-year Highs across Two-Thirds of the Great Barrier Reef* (AIMS, 2022). Much of the decline in the GBR before 2011 turned out to be due to intense tropical cyclone activity (Beeden et al., 2015), and recovery of the reef from storm damage takes years.

On the time scale of thousands of years, boron isotope proxy measurements of pH show that ocean pH was around 7.4 or 7.5 during the last Ice Age (up to about 20,000 years ago) increasing to present-day values when the world warmed during deglaciation (Rae et al., 2018). Thus, there appears to be considerable resilience of ocean biota to natural long-term changes in ocean pH since marine organisms are exposed to wide ranges in pH anyway.

It is being increasingly recognized that publication bias (alarming ocean acidification results preferred by high-impact research publications) leads to exaggerated impacts from more alkaline oceans. An ICES Journal of Marine Science Special Issue addressed this problem with an article entitled, *Towards a Broader Perspective on Ocean Acidification Research*. In the Introduction to that Special Issue, H. I. Browman stated, “As is true across all of science, studies that report no effect of ocean acidification are typically more difficult to publish.” (Browman, 2016)

Similarly, a meta-analysis of the negative effects of ocean acidification on reef fishes found that initially dramatic conclusions published in the scientific literature were all but refuted upon subsequent analysis involving larger sample sizes of data (Clements et al., 2021).

In conclusion, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the effect of ocean “acidification” on marine biota has likely been exaggerated.

References

Australian Institute of Marine Science (2022). Continued Coral Recovery Leads to 36-year Highs across Two-Thirds of the Great Barrier Reef. [https://www.aims.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-08/AIMS LTMP Report on%20GBR coral status 2021 2022 040822F3.pdf](https://www.aims.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-08/AIMS_LTMP_Report_on%20GBR_coral_status_2021_2022_040822F3.pdf)

Beeden, R., Maynard, J., Puotinen, M., Marshall, P., Dryden, J., Goldberg, J., and Williams, G. (2015). Impacts and Recovery from Severe Tropical Cyclone Yasi on the Great Barrier Reef. PLOS ONE. 10. e0121272. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121272>

Browman, H. (2016). Applying organized scepticism to ocean acidification research. iCES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil. 73. 529.1-536. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw010>

Clements, J., Sundin, J., Clark, T., Jutfelt, F. (2021). Meta-analysis reveals an extreme “decline effect” in the impacts of ocean acidification on fish behaviour. <https://doi.org/10.32942/osf.io/k9dbv>

De'ath, G., Lough, J., and Fabricius, K. (2009). Declining Coral Calcification on the Great Barrier Reef. Science (New York, N.Y.). 323. 116-9. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165283>

Gattuso, J. P. and Hansson, L. (2011). Ocean acidification: background and history Ocean Acidification ed J P Gattuso and L Hansson (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Krissansen-Totton, J., Arney, G., and Catling, D. (2018). Constraining the climate and ocean pH of the early Earth with a geological carbon cycle model. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 115. 201721296. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721296115>

Rae, J. & Burke, Andrea & Robinson, L. & Adkins, Jess & Chen, T. & Cole, C. & Greenop, R. & Li 李涛, Tao & Littley, E. & Nita, Dan & Stewart, J. & Taylor, B.. (2018). CO2 storage and release in the deep Southern Ocean on millennial to centennial timescales. Nature. 562. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0614-0>

Revelle, R. R. and R. Fairbridge (1957). Carbonate and carbon dioxide, in Treatise on Marine. Ecology and Paleoecology, Vol. 1: J. W. Hedgpeth, ed.

Ridd, Peter & Silva, Eduardo & Stieglitz, Thomas. (2013). Have coral calcification rates slowed in the last twenty years?. Marine Geology. 346. 392–399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2013.09.002>

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (2023). Is the Great Barrier Reef Making a Comeback? <https://www.whoi.edu/oceanus/feature/is-the-great-barrier-reef-making-a-comeback/>

From: Ross McKitrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 3:34 PM
To: Roy Spencer
Cc: Travis Fisher; Steven Koonin; John Christy
Subject: Re: Some Spencer inputs

I've put a couple of entries (climate change & growth, attributing causation) into the shared dropbox folder. Also a separate file accumulating references. The causation part contains some technical material though I hope the surrounding discussion helps readers navigate it as well as possible. I want to be sufficiently technical so potential critics will know that I know what I'm talking about, since I'm going after one of the IPCC's "unequivocal" positions.
-Ross

On Wed, Apr 16, 2025 at 9:02 AM Ross McKitrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:
Very good point Roy. The topics were chosen to have bearing on the topic so it is incumbent on us to make the appropriate connections. In the IPCC reports they always have paragraphs near the end of each section beginning *In summary...* which synthesizes the material. We need those here as well.

On Wed, Apr 16, 2025 at 8:16 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:
I took it upon myself to write a preamble in **Section 1.3 Drivers of climate change** (attached), which seemed necessary to introduce some basic concepts.

Also attached are my initial submissions for **1.3.2** and **1.3.3**.

NO references added yet.

One of the things I believe we need to watch out for is *neglecting to come to conclusions along the way...* There is a tendency to get mired in the technical details without getting around to saying what each section might mean in eventual policy decisions related to the Endangerment Finding. In my experience, it is not possible to dumb-down this stuff too much. I suggest some sort of "Summary Boxes" with 1-2 simplified statements highlighting a main conclusion of each section that would have policy relevance.

-Roy

From: Ross McKitrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 1:37 PM
To: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>;
roywspencer@hotmail.com <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Kickoff

Hi Travis
We developed the outline a bit further and assigned sections out yesterday. We'll keep you cc'd going forward.

Here is a Dropbox link that contains the current outline (also attached) which indicates who is working on each section

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=l1z3qj9v46elt5f4ywwxq7p8c&dl=0

The link should give you all editing privileges.

I put folders in there for each of us. If the use of that Dropbox (which is on my own account) is acceptable for this project then we can share our work using it. Otherwise once we have an official Dropbox created we can transfer the material over to it.

Do you think it would be helpful to have a section specifically addressing the question of whether CO2 is a pollutant like CO, NOx, SOx, PM, etc.? If you want to add topics or suggest changes please do, the earlier the better as we begin filling out the contents.

Cheers,
Ross

On Mon, Apr 14, 2025 at 2:12 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

This is an excellent start! Can we move forward by iterating with this document for now? Please feel free to add whatever material you like, and I can collate if there are any simultaneous changes. I will leave the substance to you all because I view my role as a facilitator rather than a contributor, but please let me know how I can be most helpful.

Steve is correct that this document should be clear and understandable for non-experts. My understanding is that it should also be sufficiently technical and comprehensive to inform policymakers on all relevant aspects of the science.

One area I can help with might be targeting your work for the very brief window we have open at the moment. I am including a few lines verbatim below from key documents to highlight the areas of inquiry that are most relevant to the policymaking process. Of course, you all should make your own judgments about what to include versus what to leave out.

Here is a key section of the Clean Air Act, 202(a)(1): "The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe (and from time to time revise) in accordance with the provisions of this section, standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Such standards shall be applicable to such vehicles and engines for their useful life (as determined under subsection (d), relating to useful life of vehicles for purposes of certification), whether such vehicles and engines are designed as complete systems or incorporate devices to prevent or control such pollution."

Section 202 can be found [here](#).

Here is another key section of the Clean Air Act, section 302(g): "The term 'air pollutant' means any air pollution agent or combination of such agents, including any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive (including source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct material) substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air. Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term 'air pollutant' is used."

A threshold question raised in Justice Scalia's dissent in *Mass v. EPA* (which can be found [here](#)) is whether CO2 falls under the definition of an "air pollutant" under the Clean Air Act. The majority in *Mass v. EPA* found that *any* compound emitted into the ambient air fits the definition of "air pollutant," leading to a colorful footnote in the Scalia dissent ("It follows that everything airborne, from Frisbees to flatulence, qualifies as an 'air pollutant.' This reading of the statute defies common sense."). A scientific interpretation of this definition could be very helpful.

The next section in the statute is 302(h), which defines effects on welfare: "All language referring to effects on welfare includes, but is not limited to, effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation, as well as effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well-being, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants." Positive impacts, including fertilization effects and beneficial warming, seem to be within scope here.

Section 302 can be found [here](#).

As you all develop the draft, I encourage you to include as many citations to published materials as possible (links would work fine as placeholders). I have found this works better under a tight timeline than going back and looking for sources later. Please also feel free to task me with any research help you might need.

Best,
Travis

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 8:10 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I assume we're writing for non-experts. If so, some educating beyond the root questions is in order (it always helps if people feel smarter after reading).

So I've taken Ross' material, added some broader context, and cast it into the forcing/response/impact syllogism that most non-experts seem to get. The result is attached.

I think we can deal with the differences relative to 2009 in an appendix.

SEK

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 6:34 PM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; steven.koonin@gmail.com; roywspencer@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Kickoff

Excellent list Ross. Wildfires are a significant topic to be addressed.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2025, at 4:05 PM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

The attached represents my summary of the most questions needing to be answered, which I think this group is capable of answering in the next couple of weeks. Probably lots of material already in hand.

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 4:24 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

I can't thank you enough for taking this on under such a tight timeline. Let's use this thread to exchange information, links, etc., and as we move forward, I'll see about a document-sharing platform and a shared document to work on simultaneously.

Best,

Travis

<DE.memo.outline.Apr.11.[RM].docx>

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 9:03 AM
To: Roy Spencer
Cc: Travis Fisher; Steven Koonin; John Christy
Subject: Re: Some Spencer inputs

Very good point Roy. The topics were chosen to have bearing on the topic so it is incumbent on us to make the appropriate connections. In the IPCC reports they always have paragraphs near the end of each section beginning *In summary...* which synthesizes the material. We need those here as well.

On Wed, Apr 16, 2025 at 8:16 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

I took it upon myself to write a preamble in **Section 1.3 Drivers of climate change** (attached), which seemed necessary to introduce some basic concepts.

Also attached are my initial submissions for **1.3.2** and **1.3.3**.

NO references added yet.

One of the things I believe we need to watch out for is *neglecting to come to conclusions along the way...* There is a tendency to get mired in the technical details without getting around to saying what each section might mean in eventual policy decisions related to the Endangerment Finding. In my experience, it is not possible to dumb-down this stuff too much. I suggest some sort of "Summary Boxes" with 1-2 simplified statements highlighting a main conclusion of each section that would have policy relevance.

-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 1:37 PM
To: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; roywspencer@hotmail.com <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Kickoff

Hi Travis

We developed the outline a bit further and assigned sections out yesterday. We'll keep you cc'd going forward.

Here is a Dropbox link that contains the current outline (also attached) which indicates who is working on each section

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=l1z3qj9v46e1t5f4ywwxq7p8c&dl=0

The link should give you all editing privileges.

I put folders in there for each of us. If the use of that Dropbox (which is on my own account) is acceptable for this project then we can share our work using it. Otherwise once we have an official Dropbox created we can transfer the material over to it.

Do you think it would be helpful to have a section specifically addressing the question of whether CO2 is a pollutant like CO, NOx, SOx, PM, etc.? If you want to add topics or suggest changes please do, the earlier the better as we begin filling out the contents.

Cheers,
Ross

On Mon, Apr 14, 2025 at 2:12 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

This is an excellent start! Can we move forward by iterating with this document for now? Please feel free to add whatever material you like, and I can collate if there are any simultaneous changes. I will leave the substance to you all because I view my role as a facilitator rather than a contributor, but please let me know how I can be most helpful.

Steve is correct that this document should be clear and understandable for non-experts. My understanding is that it should also be sufficiently technical and comprehensive to inform policymakers on all relevant aspects of the science.

One area I can help with might be targeting your work for the very brief window we have open at the moment. I am including a few lines verbatim below from key documents to highlight the areas of inquiry that are most relevant to the policymaking process. Of course, you all should make your own judgments about what to include versus what to leave out.

Here is a key section of the Clean Air Act, 202(a)(1): "The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe (and from time to time revise) in accordance with the provisions of this section, standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Such standards shall be applicable to such vehicles and engines for their useful life (as determined under subsection (d), relating to useful life of vehicles for purposes of certification), whether such vehicles and engines are designed as complete systems or incorporate devices to prevent or control such pollution."

Section 202 can be found [here](#).

Here is another key section of the Clean Air Act, section 302(g): "The term 'air pollutant' means any air pollution agent or combination of such agents, including any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive (including source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct material) substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air. Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term 'air pollutant' is used."

A threshold question raised in Justice Scalia's dissent in *Mass v. EPA* (which can be found [here](#)) is whether CO2 falls under the definition of an "air pollutant" under the Clean Air Act. The majority in *Mass v. EPA* found that *any* compound emitted into the ambient air fits the definition of "air pollutant," leading to a colorful footnote in the Scalia dissent ("It follows that everything airborne, from Frisbees to flatulence, qualifies as an 'air pollutant.' This reading of the statute defies common sense."). A scientific interpretation of this definition could be very helpful.

The next section in the statute is 302(h), which defines effects on welfare: "All language referring to effects on welfare includes, but is not limited to, effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to

transportation, as well as effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well-being, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants." Positive impacts, including fertilization effects and beneficial warming, seem to be within scope here.

Section 302 can be found [here](#).

As you all develop the draft, I encourage you to include as many citations to published materials as possible (links would work fine as placeholders). I have found this works better under a tight timeline than going back and looking for sources later. Please also feel free to task me with any research help you might need.

Best,
Travis

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 8:10 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I assume we're writing for non-experts. If so, some educating beyond the root questions is in order (it always helps if people feel smarter after reading).

So I've taken Ross' material, added some broader context, and cast it into the forcing/response/impact syllogism that most non-experts seem to get. The result is attached.

I think we can deal with the differences relative to 2009 in an appendix.

SEK

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 6:34 PM
To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Cc: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; steven.koonin@gmail.com; roywspencer@hotmail.com
Subject: Re: Kickoff

Excellent list Ross. Wildfires are a significant topic to be addressed.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2025, at 4:05 PM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

The attached represents my summary of the most questions needing to be answered, which I think this group is capable of answering in the next couple of weeks. Probably lots of material already in hand.

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 4:24 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

I can't thank you enough for taking this on under such a tight timeline. Let's use this thread to exchange information, links, etc., and as we move forward, I'll see about a document-sharing platform and a shared document to work on simultaneously.

Best,

Travis

<DE.memo.outline.Apr.11.[RM].docx>

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2025 8:17 AM
To: Ross McKittrick; Travis Fisher
Cc: Steven Koonin; John Christy
Subject: Some Spencer inputs
Attachments: 1.3 Drivers of climate change [RS].docx; 1.3.2 Naturally externally forced changes [RS].docx; 1.3.3 Anthropogenically forced changes [RS].docx

I took it upon myself to write a preamble in **Section 1.3 Drivers of climate change** (attached), which seemed necessary to introduce some basic concepts.

Also attached are my initial submissions for **1.3.2** and **1.3.3**.

NO references added yet.

One of the things I believe we need to watch out for is *neglecting to come to conclusions along the way...* There is a tendency to get mired in the technical details without getting around to saying what each section might mean in eventual policy decisions related to the Endangerment Finding. In my experience, it is not possible to dumb-down this stuff too much. I suggest some sort of "Summary Boxes" with 1-2 simplified statements highlighting a main conclusion of each section that would have policy relevance.

-Roy

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 1:37 PM
To: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; roywspencer@hotmail.com <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: Kickoff

Hi Travis

We developed the outline a bit further and assigned sections out yesterday. We'll keep you cc'd going forward.

Here is a Dropbox link that contains the current outline (also attached) which indicates who is working on each section

https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wahx6lpwzu33m5vyrr8x/ANTU1qAQJ-zXCFzP_gsJcOs?rlkey=l1z3qj9v46e1t5f4ywwxq7p8c&dl=0

The link should give you all editing privileges.

I put folders in there for each of us. If the use of that Dropbox (which is on my own account) is acceptable for this project then we can share our work using it. Otherwise once we have an official Dropbox created we can transfer the material over to it.

Do you think it would be helpful to have a section specifically addressing the question of whether CO2 is a pollutant like CO, NOx, SOx, PM, etc.? If you want to add topics or suggest changes please do, the earlier the better as we begin filling out the contents.

Cheers,
Ross

On Mon, Apr 14, 2025 at 2:12 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

This is an excellent start! Can we move forward by iterating with this document for now? Please feel free to add whatever material you like, and I can collate if there are any simultaneous changes. I will leave the substance to you all because I view my role as a facilitator rather than a contributor, but please let me know how I can be most helpful.

Steve is correct that this document should be clear and understandable for non-experts. My understanding is that it should also be sufficiently technical and comprehensive to inform policymakers on all relevant aspects of the science.

One area I can help with might be targeting your work for the very brief window we have open at the moment. I am including a few lines verbatim below from key documents to highlight the areas of inquiry that are most relevant to the policymaking process. Of course, you all should make your own judgments about what to include versus what to leave out.

Here is a key section of the Clean Air Act, 202(a)(1): "The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe (and from time to time revise) in accordance with the provisions of this section, standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. Such standards shall be applicable to such vehicles and engines for their useful life (as determined under subsection (d), relating to useful life of vehicles for purposes of certification), whether such vehicles and engines are designed as complete systems or incorporate devices to prevent or control such pollution."

Section 202 can be found [here](#).

Here is another key section of the Clean Air Act, section 302(g): "The term 'air pollutant' means any air pollution agent or combination of such agents, including any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive (including source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct material) substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air. Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term 'air pollutant' is used."

A threshold question raised in Justice Scalia's dissent in *Mass v. EPA* (which can be found [here](#)) is whether CO₂ falls under the definition of an "air pollutant" under the Clean Air Act. The majority in *Mass v. EPA* found that *any* compound emitted into the ambient air fits the definition of "air pollutant," leading to a colorful footnote in the Scalia dissent ("It follows that everything airborne, from Frisbees to flatulence, qualifies as an 'air pollutant.' This reading of the statute defies common sense."). A scientific interpretation of this definition could be very helpful.

The next section in the statute is 302(h), which defines effects on welfare: "All language referring to effects on welfare includes, but is not limited to, effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation, as well as effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well-being, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants." Positive impacts, including fertilization effects and beneficial warming, seem to be within scope here.

Section 302 can be found [here](#).

As you all develop the draft, I encourage you to include as many citations to published materials as possible (links would work fine as placeholders). I have found this works better under a tight timeline than going back and looking for sources later. Please also feel free to task me with any research help you might need.

Best,
Travis

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 8:10 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I assume we're writing for non-experts. If so, some educating beyond the root questions is in order (it always helps if people feel smarter after reading).

So I've taken Ross' material, added some broader context, and cast it into the forcing/response/impact syllogism that most non-experts seem to get. The result is attached.

I think we can deal with the differences relative to 2009 in an appendix.

SEK

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 6:34 PM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>

Cc: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>; steven.koonin@gmail.com; roywspencer@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Kickoff

Excellent list Ross. Wildfires are a significant topic to be addressed.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2025, at 4:05 PM, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

The attached represents my summary of the most questions needing to be answered, which I think this group is capable of answering in the next couple of weeks. Probably lots of material already in hand.

On Fri, Apr 11, 2025 at 4:24 PM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

I can't thank you enough for taking this on under such a tight timeline. Let's use this thread to exchange information, links, etc., and as we move forward, I'll see about a document-sharing platform and a shared document to work on simultaneously.

Best,
Travis

<DE.memo.outline.Apr.11.[RM].docx>

There are two different classes of climate change as experienced by humans at the surface of the Earth: *internally-forced*, and *externally-forced*.

Internally-forced climate variability generally involves chaotic variations in the coupled ocean-atmosphere circulation system. These variations are not well understood and are difficult (if not impossible) to forecast, although they tend to have preferred time scales, generally years to several decades. Before the 1980s, this kind of climate change dominated climate research activities, as researchers tried to document and understand events such as the Medieval Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Little Ice Age, El Nino, La Nina, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the North Atlantic Oscillation, the Arctic Oscillation, and other modes of natural climate variability.

But since the 1980s, spurred on by the regulatory success of the 1973 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, these internal sources of climate change have mostly been abandoned by the international climate research community which has been heavily funded to examine the impact of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (especially carbon dioxide) on climate. This is an example of *externally-forced* climate change, which refers to small changes in Earth's *radiative energy balance*. This is the balance between global-average solar heating (energy input) and infrared cooling (energy output), both energy flows estimated to average 235 to 245 Watts per sq. meter. When these energy flows are in balance, temperatures tend to remain unchanged. When they are out of balance, temperatures generally warm or cool. In 2025, it is estimated that the Earth's radiative energy imbalance is about 1 Watt per sq. meter (out of 235 – 245), based upon recent warming of the deep oceans and the Earth's surface.

Significantly, that current global energy imbalance is weaker than the accuracy with which we can measure any of the energy flows in the climate system. This means recent warming could be mostly natural, and we would not know it. This is just one example of the many uncertainties — often unstated and not widely appreciated — associated with current climate research.

The most common method for understanding externally-forced climate change is the *forcing-feedback* paradigm. Using the simple example of a pot of water on a stove, energy input into the pot of water from a gas flame produces a *forcing* (warming), while energy loss by the warming pot to its surroundings is negative *feedback* (acting to counteract the forcing). Once energy balance is achieved, the temperature remains constant. All planetary climate systems (Earth, Venus, Mars, etc.) that experience a change in energy input must have net negative feedback, otherwise their climate systems would be unstable with runaway warming (or cooling).

But note that the forcing can be from the cooling side of the system. This is the case with anthropogenic global warming. You can increase the temperature of a pot of water by putting a lid on the pot, which reduces the water's ability to cool to its surroundings. Similarly, the addition of CO₂ to the atmosphere causes a very small reduction in the climate system's ability to cool to outer space. This causes a warming *tendency*. Just how much warming occurs depends upon *feedbacks*, which remain quite uncertain. The issue of uncertain feedbacks will be a recurring theme in this report, and is the reason why — even after decades of research with dozens of climate models — the uncertain global warming response to a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ still ranges over a factor of three.

Unlike natural internal climate variability, which can occur with little or no changes in the Earth's radiative energy balance, there are several known sources of natural externally forced climate change. These include changes in solar activity, Earth-sun geometry impacting how much sunlight reaches the Earth, and explosive volcanic eruptions causing temporary dimming of sunlight.

Solar activity varies on an 11-year sunspot cycle which has an associated, very small ($\sim 0.1\%$) variation in total solar output. This cycle is generally considered to be too small to reliably observe in the instrumental temperature record in the presence of rather large natural climate variability, although there have been published claims over the years of various regional weather variations statistically associated with the 11-year cycle. Therefore, changes in solar heating of the Earth by variations in the 11-year cycle are generally believed to not be responsible for recent warming trends, although this belief has been challenged (Soon reference(s)).

Earth-Sun geometry changes due to slow changes in the solar and terrestrial orbits can have a much larger impact on climate, but these occur on very long time scales, generally tens of thousands of years and longer. The most famous of these is the Milankovitch cycles which are believed to have caused the semi-periodic major Ice Ages and the interglacial periods of relative warmth, such as what humanity has experienced in recent millennia. These changes, though, are too small on the time scale of $\sim 1,000$ years to account for recent warming trends.

Explosive stratovolcano eruptions such as El Chichon in 1983, and especially Mt. Pinatubo in 1991, can produce sunlight dimming for a period of 1-3 years, causing temporary summertime cooling. These impacts are short-lived, but the 1991 event was sufficiently strong (2 to 4% reduction in sunlight reaching the surface) to cause measurable summertime cooling in the Northern Hemisphere in 1992.

None of these known sources of natural externally forced changes in the climate system are believed to be sufficient to cause recent warming trends. They are generally lost in the "noise" of natural climate variability, discussed in the previous section.

The recent warming of the climate system is widely believed to be the result of anthropogenic (human-caused) forcing, mostly due to carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning. In 2025, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ is about 430 parts per million (ppm), which is approximately 50% higher than it was in pre-Industrial times. CO₂ is one of the main “greenhouse” constituents of the atmosphere (the others being water vapor, clouds, and methane) which helps to keep the climate system warm enough to support life. As mentioned above, more CO₂ in the atmosphere slightly reduces the cooling of the climate system to outer space through infrared radiation. This change in the Earth’s radiative energy balance causes a warming tendency. Just how much warming that occurs depends upon feedbacks, which act to either amplify the direct warming effects of more CO₂ (positive feedback) or reduce the direct warming (negative feedback). The uncertainty of feedbacks (especially due to cloud changes) are the reason what climate models continue to disagree with each other by a factor of three in their future warming estimates.

There are other greenhouse gases which produce lesser levels of warming, such as methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases. Much of the current report will focus on the effects of CO₂ since it is considered the main anthropogenic driver of long-term climate change.

As mentioned above, most current climate research involves understanding the long-term response of the climate system to the addition of CO₂ to the atmosphere, primarily from burning of fossil fuels. An additional anthropogenic source has been the cooling effects of sulfate aerosols, which remains a source of considerable uncertainty. Part of that uncertainty is the indirect effects of sulfate aerosols on cloud formation, which can amplify their cooling effect. As a result, understanding of the causes of recent warming is not just through the warming effects of CO₂, but of the more uncertain cooling effects of sulfate aerosols.

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 5:29 PM
To: Ross McKittrick; Roy Spencer; Steve Koonin
Subject: [4.3]Apr15[Jc] CO2 impact on global climate
Attachments: [4.3]Apr15[Jc]CO2.docx

Roy

I see you have section 4.3. Attached is a short background on the vehicle thing with calculations I did for the Vermont Trial (which eventually led to the vehicle rules and the EF) and my work on the EPA SAB vehicle rule before I was canned.

John C.

John Christy. Background comments on Section 4.3. 15 April 2025

4.3 Estimating the effect on the global climate system of variations in US tailpipe CO₂ emissions [RS]

Text text text.

Much of the federal rules about automobile emissions that led to the EF were enabled by the Vermont Federal Court bench trial, "Green Mountain Chrysler Plymouth Dodge Jeep, et al. v. Crombie, et al." in which I testified opposite James Hansen. In my written report (and in oral testimony) regarding AB1493 (a Vermont bill that established emission standards that a fossil fuel vehicle fleet could not achieve) I determined the net impact if the entire country applied the rule would be 0.01°C in 2100 with a sea level difference of 1 mm. Hansen did not rebut any of my numbers (judge Sessions even pointed that out). However, the judge decided that even though there was no impact from the rule on the climate (which was the whole point of the rule), it was just the right thing to do, so he decided against the automobile manufacturers.

I was appointed to the EPA Science Advisory Board in 2019 and served until fired by President Biden in March 2021 (a new strategy never used by a previous president for such a board). Among my tasks was to write the section on the overview of the emissions-models that determined what CO₂ impacts from the proposed rule (SAFE – Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient vehicles – i.e., allowing vehicles to be a little safer with a little more protection/weight) would occur if enacted and applied to vehicles. My conclusion was that the emissions models were not good, but that even with 100% error, they still showed negligible impact on the climate.

From my summary 31 July 2019:

One of the driving motivations for the SAFE emission standard is the potential impact on the Earth's climate of extra CO₂ emissions which directly relates to the Endangerment Finding and thus EPA's involvement. The difference regarding the impact on the climate system between the baseline-standard and the revised-standard is negligible. The EPA estimates SAFE will add 0.003 °C to the global temperature by 2100, a value that currently is too small to measure as global temperatures change by much more than this from month to month. Indeed, using the most recent empirical estimates of climate sensitivity the impact is very likely less than 0.003 °C. In terms of emissions, the net accumulation is estimated to be an extra 5.1 gt CO₂ by 2100 or about 0.08% of the atmospheric concentration at that time (Federal Register, vol. 83, no. 165, 24 Aug 2018, pg 42,986). This indicates that if the 2018 NPRM model error were ± 100% (0 to 10.2 gt CO₂), the impact on the climate system would still be negligible. Thus, large uncertainties in the inputs and processes will not impact the result in terms of absolute response of the climate system. Scaling this up to the entire world (using many simple and debatable assumptions) puts the net impact at 0.01 to 0.02 °C which is also negligible.

From: Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]
Sent: 4/27/2025 2:13:42 PM
To: 'Roy Spencer' [roywspencer@hotmail.com]; 'John Christy' [climatemanager60@gmail.com]; 'Judith Curry' [curry.judith@gmail.com]
CC: 'Ross McKittrick' [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; 'Travis Fisher' [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]
Subject: RE: Document production issues
Attachments: ~WRD0001.jpg

Figures are VERY important (picture = 1k words, etc). Current documents are light on figures, in my opinion.

Hierarchy of preference for figures (in order of decreasing perceived credibility):

- "official" consensus sources (IPCC, NCAs, NCEI, ...)
- Peer-reviewed literature from other authors
- Peer-reviewed literature from this team
- Unpublished analysis from this team

As I go through text, I'll do what I can to add (or suggest) figures to be added.

SEK

PS I will be scarce online until Wednesday PM (West Coast) due to some long-scheduled touring in NorCal.

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 9:02 AM
To: John Christy <climatemanager60@gmail.com>; Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Document production issues

It seems like we should be able to include graphical comparisons of published model output vs. published temperature data. For instance, showing one trend is greater than another trend. One should not have to peer review the fact that 0.35 is a bigger number than 0.10. -Roy

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: John Christy <climatemanager60@gmail.com>
Date: 4/27/25 7:32 AM (GMT-06:00)
To: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>, Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Document production issues

All

On figures. Pubs like the NCAs had several figures that the folks at NCEI generated themselves for the document. They basically said the data were taken from NCEI (I.e. gov) sources. But truth be told, some are somewhat difficult to reproduce, so they added their own secret sauce. My figs (those not published) are

produced with 100% NCEI data, but I had to spend 5 years organizing and keying in well over 100,000 observations from NCEI's image archive of the forms. No one on the planet has as much USHCN temp data as my database. I've submitted this for publication, but the editor said he was sending it to nine (9) reviewers, so I think he wants to deep-six it. But, all data do come from NCEI sources.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 9:45 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?


have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 9:45 AM
To: Roy Spencer
Cc: John Christy; Steven Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

Agree in principle, but there are always assumptions and these figures are not always reproducible. Adding a few more years to a published figure not a problem

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 6:02 AM Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

It seems like we should be able to include graphical comparisons of published model output vs. published temperature data. For instance, showing one trend is greater than another trend. One should not have to peer review the fact that 0.35 is a bigger number than 0.10. -Roy

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Date: 4/27/25 7:32 AM (GMT-06:00)
To: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>, Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Document production issues

All

On figures. Pubs like the NCAs had several figures that the folks at NCEI generated themselves for the document. They basically said the data were taken from NCEI (I.e. gov) sources. But truth be told, some are somewhat difficult to reproduce, so they added their own secret sauce. My figs (those not published) are produced with 100% NCEI data, but I had to spend 5 years organizing and keying in well over 100,000 observations from NCEI's image archive of the forms. No one on the planet has as much USHCN temp data as my database. I've submitted this for publication, but the editor said he was sending it to nine (9) reviewers, so I think he wants to deep-six it. But, all data do come from NCEI sources.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 9:45 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:


I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?


have a nice weekend!

--




Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012

<http://www.cfclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 9:44 AM
To: John Christy
Cc: Steven Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Roy Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

In this case, the figures can be referenced to your paper, with status of submitted

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 5:32 AM John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com> wrote:
All

On figures. Pubs like the NCAs had several figures that the folks at NCEI generated themselves for the document. They basically said the data were taken from NCEI (I.e. gov) sources. But truth be told, some are somewhat difficult to reproduce, so they added their own secret sauce. My figs (those not published) are produced with 100% NCEI data, but I had to spend 5 years organizing and keying in well over 100,000 observations from NCEI's image archive of the forms. No one on the planet has as much USHCN temp data as my database. I've submitted this for publication, but the editor said he was sending it to nine (9) reviewers, so I think he wants to deep-six it. But, all data do come from NCEI sources.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 9:45 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.
Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.

4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 9:02 AM
To: John Christy; Judith Curry
Cc: Steven Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Travis Fisher
Subject: RE: Document production issues

It seems like we should be able to include graphical comparisons of published model output vs. published temperature data. For instance, showing one trend is greater than another trend. One should not have to peer review the fact that 0.35 is a bigger number than 0.10. -Roy

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Date: 4/27/25 7:32 AM (GMT-06:00)
To: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Cc: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>, Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Document production issues

All

On figures. Pubs like the NCAs had several figures that the folks at NCEI generated themselves for the document. They basically said the data were taken from NCEI (I.e. gov) sources. But truth be told, some are somewhat difficult to reproduce, so they added their own secret sauce. My figs (those not published) are produced with 100% NCEI data, but I had to spend 5 years organizing and keying in well over 100,000 observations from NCEI's image archive of the forms. No one on the planet has as much USHCN temp data as my database. I've submitted this for publication, but the editor said he was sending it to nine (9) reviewers, so I think he wants to deep-six it. But, all data do come from NCEI sources.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 9:45 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.

2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data


3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.

4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?


have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Judith Curry
Cc: Steven Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Roy Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

All

On figures. Pubs like the NCAs had several figures that the folks at NCEI generated themselves for the document. They basically said the data were taken from NCEI (I.e. gov) sources. But truth be told, some are somewhat difficult to reproduce, so they added their own secret sauce. My figs (those not published) are produced with 100% NCEI data, but I had to spend 5 years organizing and keying in well over 100,000 observations from NCEI's image archive of the forms. No one on the planet has as much USHCN temp data as my database. I've submitted this for publication, but the editor said he was sending it to nine (9) reviewers, so I think he wants to deep-six it. But, all data do come from NCEI sources.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 9:45 PM, Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross


On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:


1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2025 10:45 PM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Ross McKittrick; John Christy; Roy Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

It would also be helpful to have a status chart or something of each chapter, in terms of who has gone through it and whether it is ready for comments

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 5:22 PM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?


have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2025 8:59 PM
To: Steven Koonin
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Judith Curry; Roy Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

Sounds like a plan.

John C.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 26, 2025, at 7:22 PM, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:


I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2025 8:22 PM
To: Ross McKitrick
Cc: Judith Curry; John Christy; Roy Spencer; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

I think there is a step missing here, which I'm happy to take on. Namely to look at each Part, if not the whole in an integrated way. Are the pieces in the optimal order? Are they tied together well? Is there duplication? Are the technical levels consistent? Sufficient figures? Etc, etc.

I did much of this for Part I, but it needs to be done for Parts II and III (have started in on the former).

Steven Koonin

On Apr 26, 2025, at 13:58, Ross McKitrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis
Will Happer
William van Wijngaarden
Peter Webster
James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)
Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.
Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:


I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Ross McKitrick <ross.mckitrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Judith Curry
Cc: John Christy; Roy Spencer; Steve Koonin; Travis Fisher
Subject: Re: Document production issues

Note the Travis cc'd on this email is not the same as the one cc'd on Judy's email so please reply all off this one.

Very good questions Judy. Here are my thoughts

1. Every one please use the Name (year) format and add the citations into the document you're working on at the end. I have a reference master list that I've accumulated from my own sections and others I've worked on. I can easily copy and paste everyone's reference list into it, sort it and remove any duplicates later.
2. Agreed on Figures. Either copied from peer-reviewed sources or govt/IPCC; or original if based on public data.
3. Travis: do we have any secretarial or document production support? We'll need time to proofread the final version.
4. Yes even though we have an extra month there's still a week's worth of final editing and proofing in my experience.

I'll add #5: I'd like to begin compiling a list of proposed reviewers. Also I'd like to offer anonymity. I recommend

Nic Lewis

Will Happer

William van Wijngaarden

Peter Webster

James Davidson (Univ Exeter economics)

Dick McNider

But we'll need a quick turnaround from whoever agrees to help.

Ross

On Sat, Apr 26, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKitrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data

3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.

4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 26, 2025 2:55 PM
To: John Christy; Roy Spencer; Steve Koonin; Ross McKittrick; Travis Kim
Subject: Document production issues


I realize i'm late to this party, so some of this may have already been decided. However, if we are a month away from submitting a final report to DOE, here are some issues that i see:

1. References: are we using footnotes, or traditional journal style referencing, e.g. McKittrick (2005) and then a bibliography? I prefer footnotes, which is the approach used in legal docs, but i am open to whatever.
2. Do we have a policy on figures? I recommend using only published figures that involve any kind of data, but we can draw our own schematics if needed. When I've worked with lawyers, they prefer govt docs (e.g IPCC, NOAA), and journal publications, and technical reports from reputable organizations. New diagrams are problematic (they receive challenges), even if straightforward analyses of data
3. Do we have anyone assigned to do document production, references/footnoting, vetting/fact checking. Anyone within DOE? anyone or your university teams? If not I have a very good person who works with me on legal docs, reports and my books.
4. It would be helpful to get a few chapters finished and agreed upon by everyone so we can start the document production process.

Other issues?

have a nice weekend!

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: John Christy [climateman60@gmail.com]
Sent: 4/28/2025 4:54:50 PM
To: Judith Curry [curry.judith@gmail.com]
CC: Ross McKittrick [ross.mckittrick@gmail.com]; Travis Fisher [travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com]; Steven Koonin [steven.koonin@gmail.com]; Roy Spencer [roywspencer@hotmail.com]
Subject: Re: Global greening


All

Meeting often would be helpful.


Regarding part II, section 9 Extremes (outline 27 April). Much is made in the NCAs about the increase in heavy rainfall events - with a strange metric they used which showed a 60% increase of total precipitation on heaviest 1% of days in the Northeast. There is evidence in some sense to support this claim. See attachments with heaviest events clustering in recent periods for 13 stations. Ross (please put these attachments in my Figures folder) and I have a published framework for looking into this. Extreme rainfall events are so chaotic, assessing significance is dicey. I will continue to build this NE daily dataset (starting in 1888 with no missings). This uptick appears to be the result of several tropical systems that drifted into the Northeast in the last 30 years.

When I have a few more stations, I'll ship the data to Ross for his credible statistical analysis.

John C.




Distribution of 10 Heaviest 3-dy Precipitation Totals in 4-year bins
Northeast US plus Montreal, 13 stations each contributing 10 events, 1889-2024



Fifth National Climate Assessment

Observed Changes in the Frequency and Severity of Heavy Precipitation Events



Heavy precipitation events are becoming more frequent and intense across much of the country.

Figure 2.8. The frequency and intensity of heavy precipitation events have increased across much of the United States, particularly the eastern part of the continental US, with implications for flood risk and infrastructure planning. Maps show observed changes in three measures of extreme precipitation: (a) total precipitation falling on the heaviest 1% of days, (b) daily maximum precipitation in a 5-year period, and (c) the annual heaviest daily precipitation amount over 1958–2021. Numbers in black circles depict percent changes at the regional level. Data were not available for the US-Affiliated Pacific Islands and the US Virgin Islands. Figure credits: (a) adapted from Easterling et al. 2017;³¹ (b, c) NOAA NCEI and CISSS NC.

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 10:32 AM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I have a person on my team who can do documentation production support, if that can be included in my contract

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 8:22 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Hey Travis can you look into whether we'll have document production support? We will need help with things like putting all the references into uniform format, same with Table and Figure captions, generating production-quality figures if they're needed, plus all the official front matter. Also we'll need a name for our team, something like the Department of Energy Special Advisory Group on Endangerment (DoE-SAGE).

It may make sense to merge 14 and 15, once the drafts are closer to final. I've just finished reading an NBER paper from 2023 that looked at temperature variations and economic growth around the world, using a method that allowed them to preserve much more regional heterogeneity than previous methods. One of the things they did was distinguish the global temperature change from local idiosyncratic temperature shocks, and they found that most of the negative effects were associated with local T changes, which (although they don't use the distinction) is weather rather than global climate. They find positive global T changes yield overwhelmingly positive growth effects around the world, especially in poor countries. and even in the places where the effect is negative, like the US, the effects are very small. SSP8.5 only yields -1.9% effect on US GDP by 2100, i.e. income grows 298% rather than 300%.

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 11:06 AM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Great exchange! As the non-expert reader, I like where you all ended up on this. If anyone is not comfortable with the new outline, we should get on a call.

In fact, at this stage--although I don't like regular meetings in general--we should have a standing call once or twice a week to maintain good communication and ensure we cover all the relevant areas. Please let me know if you're open to that. If so, we just need to pick a good time to meet.

With my economist hat on, I do have one question about the outline. Could we combine 14 and 15 to become a broader category along the lines of "Climate change and the economy"? We could discuss macroeconomic models of climate change's impact on GDP, etc., as one part (Nordhaus' Nobel), and then discuss the nuances around the magnitude and incidence of externalities (SCC) as another part. One key distinction is that previous administrations wanted a *global* SCC to form the basis of US policymaking. We should distinguish a *domestic* framework for evaluating the SCC (perhaps include both, but don't endorse a global-only framing). A level of detail that we could save for later is how the SCC (or just the "damage function") differs across the US (latitude, altitude, etc., might yield sharp distinctions). The lack of uniformity across the US could indicate gains from adaptation (like moving from a net cost area to a net benefit area).

Further, could section 16 become a conclusion? Everything before it seemed to set up a clear understanding of the question at hand: whether or not GHG emissions from US vehicles endanger human health and welfare in the US.

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

Heres an idea for part 1

Chapter 5 Direct environmental impacts of CO2

5.1 Global Greening

5.2 Ocean Acidification

This way, both can be relatively short sections, and this way it fits logically into part I

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 11:23 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Craig Idso has a ton of good material on OA here

https://www.co2science.org/subject/o/subject_o.php

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 1:33 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I like this strategy, and agree that we need ch on ocean acidification (i have material on this, but would be delighted if someone else wants to take that one)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 10:26 AM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Further thought on moving greening-I could live with it if we retitle the section as something like CO2 and its direct influences.

Then a chapter on greening. But also need to say something about ocean acidification (if we don't, we'll be called on it).

On Apr 27, 2025, at 10:00, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I had originally envisioned a separate aerosol section, but having been through Part I, I don't think it merits more than what's been written, just noting the large uncertainty in the forcing.

Steven Koonin

On Apr 27, 2025, at 09:42, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

I also agree with moving greening up front. Anytime we can reject a premise (CO2 is bad), it's a good thing.

-Roy

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 11:36 AM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Global greening

Agree with moving the greening to part I. I also agree with reframing all this differently than the IPCC

Has anyone tackled the aerosol chapter? I can do this if no one else wants it (i have huge amount of stuff on aerosol indirect effect)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 9:30 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Currently GG is a single section later in the report. But it occurs to me that we treat it as a minor topic largely because the IPCC has buried it and has always focused heavily on the temperature issue. But we don't need to be bound by this especially because the growth effects and crop water productivity improvements are so strong. I think we should elevate it to something on par with the temperature issue and bring it up right at the beginning. That would mean an sequence of topics like this:

0 Front matter

Part I: Human influence on ecosystems and the climate

- 1 Carbon dioxide as distinct from criterion air contaminants
- 2 Global greening and CO2 fertilization
- 3 Components of anthropogenic radiative forcing and their history to date
- 4 The carbon cycle and future emission scenarios
- 5 Aerosols and the uncertainties associated with them

Part II: Climate response to greenhouse gas emissions

- 6 Measuring climate sensitivity to CO2 doubling
- 7 Models versus observations in recent past
- 8 Uncertainties in analysis of attribution
- 9 Evidence on trends and attributable changes in extreme weather
- 10 Sea level rise

Part III: Impacts on ecosystems and society


- 11 Climate change and US agriculture
- 12 Managing risks of extreme weather
- 13 Mortality risk from extreme heat and cold
- 14 Climate change and economic growth
- 15 Estimates of the Social Cost of Carbon
- 16 US vehicle-based CO2 emissions and the global climate

Same material but different order and an elevation of the importance of greening.

Any thoughts?


Ross

--




Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>


--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications
Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com |
+1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Travis Fisher
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Steven Koonin; Roy Spencer; John Christy
Subject: Re: Global greening

I agree more frequent calls would be good

The outline is a bit fluid. depending on how long/substantive the individual chapters are, and titles will probably change slightly. The chapter on the SCC is pretty substantive; if ch 14 is relatively short, they could be combined.

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 8:06 AM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Great exchange! As the non-expert reader, I like where you all ended up on this. If anyone is not comfortable with the new outline, we should get on a call.

In fact, at this stage--although I don't like regular meetings in general--we should have a standing call once or twice a week to maintain good communication and ensure we cover all the relevant areas. Please let me know if you're open to that. If so, we just need to pick a good time to meet.

With my economist hat on, I do have one question about the outline. Could we combine 14 and 15 to become a broader category along the lines of "Climate change and the economy"? We could discuss macroeconomic models of climate change's impact on GDP, etc., as one part (Nordhaus' Nobel), and then discuss the nuances around the magnitude and incidence of externalities (SCC) as another part. One key distinction is that previous administrations wanted a *global* SCC to form the basis of US policymaking. We should distinguish a *domestic* framework for evaluating the SCC (perhaps include both, but don't endorse a global-only framing). A level of detail that we could save for later is how the SCC (or just the "damage function") differs across the US (latitude, altitude, etc., might yield sharp distinctions). The lack of uniformity across the US could indicate gains from adaptation (like moving from a net cost area to a net benefit area).

Further, could section 16 become a conclusion? Everything before it seemed to set up a clear understanding of the question at hand: whether or not GHG emissions from US vehicles endanger human health and welfare in the US.

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

Heres an idea for part 1

Chapter 5 Direct environmental impacts of CO2

5.1 Global Greening

5.2 Ocean Acidification

This way, both can be relatively short sections, and this way it fits logically into part I

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 11:23 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Craig Idso has a ton of good material on OA here

https://www.co2science.org/subject/o/subject_o.php

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 1:33 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I like this strategy, and agree that we need ch on ocean acidification (i have material on this, but would be delighted if someone else wants to take that one)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 10:26 AM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Further thought on moving greening-I could live with it if we retitle the section as something like CO2 and its direct influences.

Then a chapter on greening. But also need to say something about ocean acidification (if we don't, we'll be called on it).

On Apr 27, 2025, at 10:00, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I had originally envisioned a separate aerosol section, but having been through Part I, I don't think it merits more than what's been written, just noting the large uncertainty in the forcing.

Steven Koonin

On Apr 27, 2025, at 09:42, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

I also agree with moving greening up front. Anytime we can reject a premise (CO2 is bad), it's a good thing.

-Roy

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 11:36 AM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Global greening

Agree with moving the greening to part I. I also agree with reframing all this differently than the IPCC

Has anyone tackled the aerosol chapter? I can do this if no one else wants it (i have huge amount of stuff on aerosol indirect effect)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 9:30 AM Ross McKittrick

<ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Currently GG is a single section later in the report. But it occurs to me that we treat it as a minor topic largely because the IPCC has buried it and has always focused heavily on the temperature issue. But we don't need to be

bound by this especially because the growth effects and crop water productivity improvements are so strong. I think we should elevate it to something on par with the temperature issue and bring it up right at the beginning. That would mean an sequence of topics like this:

0 Front matter

Part I: Human influence on ecosystems and the climate

- 1 Carbon dioxide as distinct from criterion air contaminants
- 2 Global greening and CO2 fertilization
- 3 Components of anthropogenic radiative forcing and their history to date
- 4 The carbon cycle and future emission scenarios
- 5 Aerosols and the uncertainties associated with them

Part II: Climate response to greenhouse gas emissions

- 6 Measuring climate sensitivity to CO2 doubling
- 7 Models versus observations in recent past
- 8 Uncertainties in analysis of attribution
- 9 Evidence on trends and attributable changes in extreme weather
- 10 Sea level rise

Part III: Impacts on ecosystems and society

- 11 Climate change and US agriculture
- 12 Managing risks of extreme weather
- 13 Mortality risk from extreme heat and cold
- 14 Climate change and economic growth
- 15 Estimates of the Social Cost of Carbon
- 16 US vehicle-based CO2 emissions and the global climate

Same material but different order and an elevation of the importance of greening.


Any thoughts?

Ross

--




Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>




Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:23 AM
To: Travis Fisher
Cc: Judith Curry; Steven Koonin; Roy Spencer; John Christy
Subject: Re: Global greening

Hey Travis can you look into whether we'll have document production support? We will need help with things like putting all the references into uniform format, same with Table and Figure captions, generating production-quality figures if they're needed, plus all the official front matter. Also we'll need a name for our team, something like the Department of Energy Special Advisory Group on Endangerment (DoE-SAGE).

It may make sense to merge 14 and 15, once the drafts are closer to final. I've just finished reading an NBER paper from 2023 that looked at temperature variations and economic growth around the world, using a method that allowed them to preserve much more regional heterogeneity than previous methods. One of the things they did was distinguish the global temperature change from local idiosyncratic temperature shocks, and they found that most of the negative effects were associated with local T changes, which (although they don't use the distinction) is weather rather than global climate. They find positive global T changes yield overwhelmingly positive growth effects around the world, especially in poor countries. and even in the places where the effect is negative, like the US, the effects are very small. SSP8.5 only yields -1.9% effect on US GDP by 2100, i.e. income grows 298% rather than 300%.

On Mon, Apr 28, 2025 at 11:06 AM Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com> wrote:

Great exchange! As the non-expert reader, I like where you all ended up on this. If anyone is not comfortable with the new outline, we should get on a call.

In fact, at this stage--although I don't like regular meetings in general--we should have a standing call once or twice a week to maintain good communication and ensure we cover all the relevant areas. Please let me know if you're open to that. If so, we just need to pick a good time to meet.

With my economist hat on, I do have one question about the outline. Could we combine 14 and 15 to become a broader category along the lines of "Climate change and the economy"? We could discuss macroeconomic models of climate change's impact on GDP, etc., as one part (Nordhaus' Nobel), and then discuss the nuances around the magnitude and incidence of externalities (SCC) as another part. One key distinction is that previous administrations wanted a *global* SCC to form the basis of US policymaking. We should distinguish a *domestic* framework for evaluating the SCC (perhaps include both, but don't endorse a global-only framing). A level of detail that we could save for later is how the SCC (or just the "damage function") differs across the US (latitude, altitude, etc., might yield sharp distinctions). The lack of uniformity across the US could indicate gains from adaptation (like moving from a net cost area to a net benefit area).

Further, could section 16 become a conclusion? Everything before it seemed to set up a clear understanding of the question at hand: whether or not GHG emissions from US vehicles endanger human health and welfare in the US.

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

Heres an idea for part 1

Chapter 5 Direct environmental impacts of CO2

5.1 Global Greening

5.2 Ocean Acidification

This way, both can be relatively short sections, and this way it fits logically into part I

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 11:23 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Craig Idso has a ton of good material on OA here

https://www.co2science.org/subject/o/subject_o.php

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 1:33 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:

I like this strategy, and agree that we need ch on ocean acidification (i have material on this, but would be delighted if someone else wants to take that one)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 10:26 AM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Further thought on moving greening-I could live with it if we retile the section as something like CO2 and its direct influences.

Then a chapter on greening. But also need to say something about ocean acidification (if we don't, we'll be called on it).

On Apr 27, 2025, at 10:00, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I had originally envisioned a separate aerosol section, but having been through Part I, I don't think it merits more than what's been written, just noting the large uncertainty in the forcing.

Steven Koonin

On Apr 27, 2025, at 09:42, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

I also agree with moving greening up front. Anytime we can reject a premise (CO2 is bad), it's a good thing.

-Roy

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 11:36 AM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer

<roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Travis

Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Global greening

Agree with moving the greening to part I. I also agree with reframing all this differently than the IPCC

Has anyone tackled the aerosol chapter? I can do this if no one else wants it (i have huge amount of stuff on aerosol indirect effect)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 9:30 AM Ross McKittrick

<ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Currently GG is a single section later in the report. But it occurs to me that we treat it as a minor topic largely because the IPCC has buried it and has always focused heavily on the temperature issue. But we don't need to be bound by this especially because the growth effects and crop water productivity improvements are so strong. I think we should elevate it to something on par with the temperature issue and bring it up right at the beginning. That would mean an sequence of topics like this:

0 Front matter

Part I: Human influence on ecosystems and the climate

- 1 Carbon dioxide as distinct from criterion air contaminants
- 2 Global greening and CO2 fertilization
- 3 Components of anthropogenic radiative forcing and their history to date
- 4 The carbon cycle and future emission scenarios
- 5 Aerosols and the uncertainties associated with them

Part II: Climate response to greenhouse gas emissions

- 6 Measuring climate sensitivity to CO2 doubling
- 7 Models versus observations in recent past
- 8 Uncertainties in analysis of attribution
- 9 Evidence on trends and attributable changes in extreme weather
- 10 Sea level rise

Part III: Impacts on ecosystems and society

- 11 Climate change and US agriculture
- 12 Managing risks of extreme weather
- 13 Mortality risk from extreme heat and cold
- 14 Climate change and economic growth
- 15 Estimates of the Social Cost of Carbon
- 16 US vehicle-based CO2 emissions and the global climate

Same material but different order and an elevation of the importance of greening.

Any thoughts?

Ross

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President
CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network
Reno, NV USA
curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012
<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

From: Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 11:07 AM
To: Judith Curry
Cc: Ross McKittrick; Steven Koonin; Roy Spencer; John Christy
Subject: Re: Global greening

Great exchange! As the non-expert reader, I like where you all ended up on this. If anyone is not comfortable with the new outline, we should get on a call.

In fact, at this stage--although I don't like regular meetings in general--we should have a standing call once or twice a week to maintain good communication and ensure we cover all the relevant areas. Please let me know if you're open to that. If so, we just need to pick a good time to meet.

With my economist hat on, I do have one question about the outline. Could we combine 14 and 15 to become a broader category along the lines of "Climate change and the economy"? We could discuss macroeconomic models of climate change's impact on GDP, etc., as one part (Nordhaus' Nobel), and then discuss the nuances around the magnitude and incidence of externalities (SCC) as another part. One key distinction is that previous administrations wanted a *global* SCC to form the basis of US policymaking. We should distinguish a *domestic* framework for evaluating the SCC (perhaps include both, but don't endorse a global-only framing). A level of detail that we could save for later is how the SCC (or just the "damage function") differs across the US (latitude, altitude, etc., might yield sharp distinctions). The lack of uniformity across the US could indicate gains from adaptation (like moving from a net cost area to a net benefit area).

Further, could section 16 become a conclusion? Everything before it seemed to set up a clear understanding of the question at hand: whether or not GHG emissions from US vehicles endanger human health and welfare in the US.

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 2:54 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
Heres an idea for part 1

Chapter 5 Direct environmental impacts of CO2
5.1 Global Greening
5.2 Ocean Acidification

This way, both can be relatively short sections, and this way it fits logically into part I

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 11:23 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:
Craig Idso has a ton of good material on OA here
https://www.co2science.org/subject/o/subject_o.php

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 1:33 PM Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com> wrote:
I like this strategy, and agree that we need ch on ocean acidification (i have material on this, but would be delighted if someone else wants to take that one)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 10:26 AM Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

Further thought on moving greening-I could live with it if we retitle the section as something like CO2 and its direct influences.

Then a chapter on greening. But also need to say something about ocean acidification (if we don't, we'll be called on it).

On Apr 27, 2025, at 10:00, Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com> wrote:

I had originally envisioned a separate aerosol section, but having been through Part I, I don't think it merits more than what's been written, just noting the large uncertainty in the forcing.

Steven Koonin

On Apr 27, 2025, at 09:42, Roy Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com> wrote:

I also agree with moving greening up front. Anytime we can reject a premise (CO2 is bad), it's a good thing.

-Roy

From: Judith Curry <curry.judith@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2025 11:36 AM

To: Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com>

Cc: John Christy <climateman60@gmail.com>; Roy W. Spencer <roywspencer@hotmail.com>; Steven Koonin <steven.koonin@gmail.com>; Travis Fisher <travis.scott.fisher@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Global greening

Agree with moving the greening to part I. I also agree with reframing all this differently than the IPCC

Has anyone tackled the aerosol chapter? I can do this if no one else wants it (i have huge amount of stuff on aerosol indirect effect)

On Sun, Apr 27, 2025 at 9:30 AM Ross McKittrick <ross.mckittrick@gmail.com> wrote:

Currently GG is a single section later in the report. But it occurs to me that we treat it as a minor topic largely because the IPCC has buried it and has always focused heavily on the temperature issue. But we don't need to be bound by this especially because the growth effects and crop water productivity improvements are so strong. I think we should elevate it to something on par with the temperature issue and bring it up right at the beginning. That would mean an sequence of topics like this:

0 Front matter

Part I: Human influence on ecosystems and the climate

- 1 Carbon dioxide as distinct from criterion air contaminants
- 2 Global greening and CO2 fertilization
- 3 Components of anthropogenic radiative forcing and their history to date
- 4 The carbon cycle and future emission scenarios
- 5 Aerosols and the uncertainties associated with them

Part II: Climate response to greenhouse gas emissions

- 6 Measuring climate sensitivity to CO2 doubling
- 7 Models versus observations in recent past
- 8 Uncertainties in analysis of attribution
- 9 Evidence on trends and attributable changes in extreme weather
- 10 Sea level rise

Part III: Impacts on ecosystems and society


- 11 Climate change and US agriculture
- 12 Managing risks of extreme weather
- 13 Mortality risk from extreme heat and cold
- 14 Climate change and economic growth
- 15 Estimates of the Social Cost of Carbon
- 16 US vehicle-based CO2 emissions and the global climate

Same material but different order and an elevation of the importance of greening.

Any thoughts?

Ross

--



Judith Curry, President

CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network

Reno, NV USA

curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012

<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--



Judith Curry, President

CFAN - Climate Forecast Applications Network

Reno, NV USA

curry.judith@cfanclimate.com | +1.404.803.2012

<http://www.cfanclimate.net>

--